DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 229 SO 010 091

AUTHOR	Jorrin, Valerie, Ed.
TITLE	The Need for Manpower Specialists: A New Role for Social Workers. A Report of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work (New York, New York, April 11-13, 1973).
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. School of Social Work.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
PUB DATE	[73]
GRANT	DL-92-34-70-16
NOTE	111p.; For a related document, see SO 010 092
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; Doctoral Programs; Federal Programs; Field Experience Programs; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Manpower Development; *Manpower Needs; Professional Training; Program Descriptions; Social Welfare; *Social Work; Social Workers

ABSTRACT

This conference report is one of three volumes issued by the Laboratory for Community Programming at the conclusion of its three-year, experimental program. The Laboratory was created to study and initiate programs correlating the field of social work with that of manpower needs. Papers presented explore the major questions concerning processes in social work and manpower, collaboration and competition, and curriculum content. They are arranged in four sections. Section one focuses on the need for the mutual development of social work and manpower programs, as well as the problems, challenges, and trends anticipated by this collaboration. Section two, notes and comments, addresses several questions. Briefly considered are such questions as why social workers should be involved in manpower, what kind of preparation is necessary, what jobs are to be done, and what is the role of social work education. The third section is devoted to curriculum development in the social work/manpower field. This section contains outlines for an interdisciplinary seminar, a master's degree program, a doctor's degree program, and the manpower components in a social work curriculum. The reports in section four consider the future by discussing challenges that must be met while urging caution in the development of new programs. Implications for the National Association for Social Workers are also discussed. (KC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED141229

JUN 13 1977

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE NEED FOR MANPOWER SPECIALISTS:

A NEW ROLE FOR SOCIAL WORKERS

A Report of the
National Workshop on
Manpower Curriculum Development
in Social Work

April 11-12-13, 1973
New York City

Edited by

Valerie Jorrin

Laboratory for Community Programming
Columbia University School of Social Work
New York City

SP 010 091

This conference was made possible by grant #92-34-70-16, from the Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor.

CONTENTS

Foreword 5

Tribute 11

I. PERSPECTIVES FOR THE MID-1970's

Social Work and Manpower: Prospects and Problems of Mutual Development

Russell A. Nixon 15

The Manpower Challenge to Social Work

Eli Ginzberg 28

Social Work and Manpower--A Veiled Interface

Joseph L. Vigilante 36

Towards a New Employment Strategy: One City's View

Lucille Rose 44

Trends in National Manpower Policies, Program Priorities and Staffing Needs

Davis A. Portner 53

II. CONFERENCE NOTES AND COMMENTS

Why Should Social Workers Be Involved in Manpower? 59

What Kind of Preparation Is Necessary? 62

What Jobs Have To Be Done? 65

What Should Social Work Education Do? 68

III. APPROACHES TO CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The Dimensions of Human Resource Policy: An Interdisciplinary Seminar
Herbert S. Parnes 73

Manpower Development Professionals: A Specialized Masters Degree Program
Henry Cohen 81

Manpower Development and Social Welfare: An Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program
Dennis Derryck 85

Industrial Social Welfare: Training Social Workers for the World of Work
Hyman J. Weiner 88

What Every Social Worker Should Know: Generic Manpower Components for the Social Work Curriculum
Edward E. Schwartz 91

Training Manpower Professionals in Social Work: A Curriculum for Specialists
Harry Specht 96

Training Social Workers: A Manpower Concentration in Social Work
Valerie Jorrin 100

IV. THOUGHTS FOR THE FUTURE
Jule M. Sugarman 107

V. A MANPOWER PERSPECTIVE FOR NASW
Mark Battle 115

Participants 119

FOREWORD

The National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work was organized to provide a forum for social work educators, social workers engaged in manpower programs, and others from the manpower field to discuss the educational, practice and policy issues involved in professional collaboration.

The conference was convened at a time when overall human resources programs represented a $5 billion spending level and when new legislation and policy direction increasingly mandated direct links between welfare and employment programs. The service demands on welfare and manpower agencies were enlarging in number and scope; the services they were supposed to provide included employability assessments, remedial education, vocational training, job counseling and referral, day care, health services, and other supportive activities.

These developments underscored the recognized need in the manpower field for trained manpower administrators, planners, and direct service workers. A very limited number of academic programs exist which are specifically designed to train manpower administrators and planners. Most manpower professionals learn about their field on the job--invaluable experience, but limited in the number of expert staff produced and in their academic preparation.* Yet no one academic or professional field provides adequate preparation for dealing with the social, economic, political, and organizational problems intrinsic to planning, service delivery, and administration of manpower programs.

Social work education, in its structure and content, provides an educational resource for training professionals knowledgeable about the world of work who will function as planners, administrators, and direct service workers in manpower. The educational structure is built around a combination of supervised field work in which a student carries out professional assignments, and an academic program based in the social sciences which includes work in methodology and social policy. Among social work educators, there is increasing interest in public administration and

---

*See John Niland, The Production of Manpower Specialists, report of a conference held at Cornell University, 1970, which documents the problem from several perspectives.

planning and the inclusion of course materials and field work programs dealing with manpower and other substantive areas.

Encouraging this trend, the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, had funded a number of porjects at schools of social work dealing with aspects of the collaborative relationship between social welfare and manpower professionals. Those in operation or completed at the time of the conference included the Laboratory for Community Programming at Columbia University, the sponsor of the conference, for exploration of social work-manpower collaboration in curriculum development and practice; the University of Chicago, University of Michigan, and Case Western Reserve University for a three-way study of decision-making in the WIN program; Rutgers University and Washington University for training programs for WIN staff; Michigan State University for a study of undergraduate social work education in relation to staffing needs of the WIN program; and Brandeis University and West Virginia University for a variety of research and demonstration projects under the institutional grant program. The Council on Social Work Education compiled a text for use by schools of social work, Manpower and Employment, A Source Book for Social Workers, published in 1972, under a related grant.

In addition to those who had worked on the projects noted above, manpower administrators, social work educators and practitioners, economists, sociologists and others from allied fields were invited to participate in this conference. Although the number of participants originally envisioned was thirty, the interest generated around the country brought the final number to eighty.

The conference opened with remarks by Eli Ginzberg, Chairman of the National Manpower Policy Task Force, and prepared papers given by Joseph Vigilante, Dean of the Adelphi University School of Social Work; Lucille Rose, Commissioner of the New York City Department of Employment; and Davis A. Portner, Director of the Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation of the United States Department of Labor. They each presented, from their respective positions, a view of the potential for programmatic collaboration.

Professor Ginzberg, colleague at Columbia University and one of the pre-eminent figures in the manpower field, graced the conference with his wit and broad knowledge as he outlined several critical problem areas--the transition from school to work, the employment of women on welfare, the use of government programs in job creation, the ability of manpower programs to help people obtain and retain jobs, and the extent of illicit and illegal work. He chided the social work profession for failing to pay attention to the role of

work in modern society as he illustrated the need for social work intervention in these problem areas.

Dean Vigilante, a social work educator whose dissertation subject was manpower, provided a historical context in which he pointed out the common ground between social work and manpower--a primary concern with the disadvantaged, services for the underclass, dependence on the public sector, and encouragement of minority professionals. He contrasted the differences in professional status, academic and methodological emphases, and the inclusion of humanistic values as part of social work training, concluding that each area of professional practice had complementary strengths which could be of mutual benefit.

Commissioner Rose, head of the newly-created municipal employment system, outlined New York City's current employment strategy--and emphasis on on-the-job training and subsidized jobs leading to opportunities for self-supporting, competitive employment. She cited a need for social workers at various points in the service delivery system, particularly as "case managers" with a knowledge of labor market economics, social psychology, sociology, and group dynamics.

Mr. Portner, with a view from Washington, outlined the Administration's objectives in converting the funding and direction of manpower programs and policies to local control under manpower revenue sharing. He estimated that 50,000 people would be working in federally-funded manpower programs during Fiscal Year 1974, but that local authorities would be determining program emphases, types of personnel, and other administrative and operational matters.

These papers, together with an introduction written especially for this report by Russell A. Nixon shortly before his untimely death, comprise the first section of this report. The second section is a selection of comments on major themes, culled from notes and transcripts, doing justice to no one but, we hope, giving a sense of the discussion. The third section covers seven approaches to curriculum development as they were described or developed in the workshops--an interdisciplinary seminar; a specialized masters degree program; generic components for the social work curriculum; a curriculum for manpower specialists in social work; an interdisciplinary doctoral program; a program in industrial social welfare; and a specialized field work program.

Then, some thoughts for the future. Jule M. Sugarman, head of New York City's Human Resources Administration at the time of the conference, and now responsible for administering the City of Atlanta, reflected on broad societal changes that he saw occurring--changes in expectations in regard to school,

marriage, family life, work and career--that will certainly call for changes in services for people. He agreed with the conference's thrust against narrow specialization, advising against parochial professionalism and looking instead for "people who have some facts to do a job and an interest in their work." He spoke against developing a separate manpower curriculum within a school of social work, but supported--as did all the participants--the conclusion that every social work student should have courses with manpower content, "because that is something we are going to have to deal with as part of any kind of social work experience."

Mark Battle concurred from the perspective of the National Association of Social Workers. As its Associate Executive Director, and as a former Deputy Director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, he spoke with experience as a social worker in manpower. He told the conference that "the setting doesn't necessarily define the profession" and outlined current activities of the NASW which are leading toward more functional professional definitions. He predicted that NASW would pay increasing attention to issues of income maintenance and manpower along with refining professional expectations of what social workers do.

The conference provided an opportunity for its participants to explore the major questions concerning processes in social work and manpower, collaboration and competition, and curriculum content. After two-and-a-half days of discussion, it was apparent that a consensus on several major themes had emerged:

> First, that all social workers, whatever their area of practice or substantive interest, needed to know more about the world of work.
>
> Second, that schools of social work could, with little difficulty, add material dealing with the world of work to all basic courses and field work.
>
> Third, that the standard social work curriculum--in content and the class-field educational structure--lent itself to the training of professionals prepared to work in the manpower field.
>
> Fourth, that a narrowly-defined specialty in manpower within a social work curriculum was neither necessary nor desirable, but that additions to core curriculum and new approaches to field work in the manpower area should be developed.
>
> Fifth, that a community of interest and clientele existed between the two areas, but historic practices

have contributed to the maintenance of professional antagonisms.

As to specific curriculum content, it was clear that each institution would have to devise its own programs according to its particular objectives, emphases, and resources.

This conference was sponsored and convened by the Laboratory for Community Programming at the Columbia University School of Social Work, under a grant from the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor. This grant supported the Laboratory as a demonstration program to explore ways in which social workers being trained in community organization and planning could provide a new professional resource in the manpower field. In its third and final year, the Laboratory organized this conference in culmination of its demonstration activities.

This conference report is one of three volumes being issued by the Laboratory for Community Programming at the conclusion of its experimental program. Another is a collection of course outlines and reading lists gathered from scholars at universities around the country. The course materials reflect the diversity of academic sponsorship for manpower subject matter. The materials are organized from the perspective of social work education and practice, and suggest a number of ways to incorporate manpower content into social work curricula.

The third volume is a comprehensive report on the three-year Laboratory project, including descriptions of student field work experiences during the Laboratory's definitive last year. These included field work assignments with the Department of Labor Regional Manpower Administrator's Office; New York State Employment Service; New York City Manpower Area Planning Council (CAMPS); New York City Human Resources Administration and Department of Employment; and the Columbia Day Care Project. The first five placements were new to social workers; the latter was a special technical assistance program established by the Laboratory.

I would like to express here my appreciation to all those who attended the conference for their interest and thoughtful contributions, and to extend my particular thanks to the speakers, Mark Battle, Eli Ginzberg, Davis Portner, Lucille Rose, Jule Sugarman, and Joseph Vigilante; to the workshop

leaders, Frank Breul, Eli Cohen, Bernard Coughlin, and Elwood Taub; to the workshop reporters, David Franklin, Edward Schwartz, and Harry Specht; and to those who provided special insights into curriculum development, Henry Cohen, Dennis Derryck, Herbert Parnes, and Hyman Weiner.

Finally, I am very grateful to Beverly Bachemin and Joseph Seiler of the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor, for their continuing support and guidance; to Mitchell Ginsberg, Dean of the Columbia University School of Social Work and to Sidney Berengarten, Associate Dean and Director of Field Work; to the staff of the Laboratory for Community Programming, Frank Kushin and Nancy Kolben, assistant directors; Dorothy Taub, conference coordinator; and Carolyn Cunningham and Erika Muehl, secretaries; to Florence Nixon, for gracious encouragement in a difficult time; and to the students of the Laboratory in 1972-73, Ruth Antoniades, James Drinane, Barbara Leiser, Walter Leutz, Joanne Searcy, Onella Stagoll, and Robert Tropp, for showing how challenging field work can be.

Valerie Jorrin, Project Director
Laboratory for Community Programming

Russ Nixon taught one of the first courses in manpower offered at a school of social work, teaching students to understand the functioning of the labor market, the implications of employment policies, and the importance and meaning of work. He encouraged professional social workers and manpower administrators to utilize each other's expertise, speaking and writing extensively on the relationship of the two fields. As an economist, as a manpower expert, and as a social thinker, he devoted much time and effort to the development of federal manpower legislation. He worked closely with leaders in Congress, the labor movement and public interest organizations to formulate meaningful employment policies and programs.

The National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work owed much to his assistance in planning the conference and defining the issues from the perspectives of both manpower and social work. The students and staff of the Laboratory for Community Programming benefited greatly from his knowledge and encouragement.

Shortly before his sudden death on December 7, 1973, Russ Nixon wrote the introduction to this conference report. It expresses his conviction that the social work profession and the manpower field must come together--a conviction that became a mission during the last years of his highly productive life.

We are all very grateful to him.

I. PERSPECTIVES FOR THE MID-1970's

SOCIAL WORK AND MANPOWER: PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS OF MUTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Russell A. Nixon
Columbia University School of Social Work

Developments in manpower policies and programs, plus the need of social work for dynamic definition and the realization of its full professional role, combine to make the manpower-social work relationship an important issue.

The main impetus for exploring the potentialities of this relationship--and the ways and means of developing it--has come from the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor which has, of necessity, been concerned with the serious problems of staffing a huge and burgeoning manpower system. Social work has been hesitant in its response. Only now is it beginning to give attention to the manpower area.

Among the serious difficulties in developing the social work-manpower combination, one set of problems seems to flow from a lack of clarity about functions, skills and processes within the social work profession itself. There is healthy debate and inquiry about this, and the result may well be a significant advance in clarifying the unique and crucial role of social work in the social service system.[1] Meanwhile,

---

Russell A. Nixon was Associate Professor of Social Policy at the Columbia University School of Social Work. An economist, he had been involved in the manpower field for many years as a writer, teacher, Washington representative in the labor movement, and as a consultant on the federal, state, and city levels.

[1] See for example these recent articles: Ann Hartman, "But What is Social Casework?," Social Casework, July 1971, Vol. 52 No. 7, and Joel Fischer, "Is Casework Effective? A Review," Social Work, January 1973, Vol. 18 No. 1.

this uncertainty reflects a long-held "inferiority complex" in relation to other social professions, and probably inhibits social work from aggressively pursuing its potential in the human resources field. For most of the social work establishment the word "manpower" used in connection with social work simply refers to the preparation and supply of personnel for social work employment. The difficulties were reflected in the conference held by the Columbia University School of Social Work under Department of Labor auspices which brought forty social work leaders and thirty manpower experts together for three days of discussion of "The Need for Manpower Specialists: A New Role for Social Workers." Significantly, the pressing question posed by a high level manpower official functioning in the State Employment Service--"What special and unique contribution do social work professionals have to offer in the manpower process?"--went largely unanswered.

There is also uncertainty in the manpower system which, more than a decade after the legislative "Manpower Revolution," remains uncoordinated, almost chaotically diffused among thirty or so programs, and lacks a comprehensive concept of human resource development. It has not been able to develop an integrated approach to the labor market, not simply as an economic problem of supply and demand, but an overwhelming social problem involving a large part of the labor force that is disadvantaged in the competition for jobs. The federal-state Employment Service system continues to function primarily as a labor exchange: uncoordinated, unsympathetic, and often at war with the welfare-rehabilitative approach to the large, marginal population needing remedial services.

It is not surprising that attempts to marry the manpower-social work fields confront difficulties. If social work and manpower were areas of small or transitory importance, these difficulties might justify abandoning the courtship. But ineluctably the problems of the world of work, of manpower, of human resources, of people in the labor market are bound to grow in importance and command more resources. Social work, as a central core of helping services in our complicated and beleageured society, both needs to be and is needed as an important participant in the manpower system. But what is it that manpower programs need from social work? What can social workers contribute? What new capacities and

knowledge are required for social workers to maximize the application of their basic skills in the manpower field?

There are two major categories in the social work-manpower connection. First is the participation of social workers as "manpower for manpower," sharing in the tasks and jobs of the manpower system. On one level, this simply means that social workers share with economists, sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, etc., the jobs needed to staff the various manpower programs throughout the country. On another level, it is reasonable to expect that social workers with preparatory experience and education about the world of work can make a special contribution in the manpower system. At both levels, social workers should be involved in all areas of the manpower process, which range from individual and group services to enhance employability, neighborhood and community services, program supervision and administration, research and evaluation, policy and planning.

The second category connects social work and manpower through the work experience itself to those individual problems and pathologies which are the concern of all social workers. Income inadequacies, social pathologies and deviations, stresses and strains are to a large degree affected by a person's experience in the labor market: the lack of job opportunities, discrimination, alienation, insecurity, and poverty-level wages. Equally obvious, the treatment of these individual and social difficulties often depends for success upon action in the manpower field which could open up realistic employment opportunities. In spite of these "obvious" points, there appears to be little attention to the world of work in most current social work education and related field placements. There is an urgent need to add substantive knowledge about work and manpower to the generic curriculum for training all social work practitioners.

These two categories of the social work-manpower connection are quite distinct. It is the first, reflecting the manpower systems concern about its staffing problems, which recently has received attention through the encouragement and support of the United States Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. But for social work in general, and for social work education, awareness and understanding of the world of work

as part of the general curriculum is very important. It is probable, moreover, that if every social worker comes to possess general manpower knowledge which he applies in social work practice, the participation of social workers in the manpower system itself will be enhanced.

The Manpower System

The claim of the manpower field for social work attention rests both upon the size of the field as a major part of the national human service delivery system, and upon the evolving qualitative requirements which stress careful social remedial and rehabilitative services for the manpower system's target population.

The Size and Breadth of the Manpower System

The magnitude of the government's manpower programs is of recent origin, the product of the last decade of social, anti-poverty, and human resource legislation. In 1961, the federal expenditure for manpower programs was $239 million. By 1973, this figure had grown to $5.3 billion--more than a twenty-fold increase (see Table I). Manpower expenditures at a state and local level, and in the private sector, must be added to this federal $5 billion program to complete the picture.

Twenty-four separate programs are listed in the official "Guide to Federally Assisted Manpower Training and Support Programs."[1] The major programs, listed by persons served in 1969, indicate the diversity and breadth of the federal manpower commitment:

Program Title and Date Started	Persons Served in Fiscal 1969
Federal-State Employment Service System, 1933	Approximately 10 million job applications
Vocational Education, 1917	Over 8 million enrollments
Vocational Rehabilitation, 1920	781,000 persons served
Neighborhood Youth Corps, 1965	Over 500,000 persons served

[1] 1970 Manpower Report of the President, United States Department of Labor, Appendix, pp. 193-197.

Adult Basic Education, 1964	Over 500,000 enrollments
Apprenticeship, 1937	250,000 registered
MDTA Training, 1962	220,000 enrollments
Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), 1967	127,000 enrollments
Community Action Program, 1964	150,000 receiving manpower-related services
Work Incentive (WIN), 1968	600,000 enrollments (Fiscal 1973)
Job Corps, 1965	53,000 enrollments
Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, 1968	170,000 total hires
Defense Department Project 100,000, 1966 and Transition, 1968	103,000 served 370,000 trained or counseled
Operation Mainstream, 1965	11,300 enrollments
Public Service Careers	Over 30,000 enrollments

In the Department of Labor alone, "nearly 1.3 million jobless or underemployed persons were in manpower training and employment programs" in July 1972.[1]

These programs spread throughout all levels of government and relate to rural areas, towns, and cities. They tie into a comprehensive range of government programs affecting such diverse groups as returning veterans, retired workers, narcotics offenders, welfare clients, high school graduates, and juvenile delinquents. They relate to programs which deal with racial discrimination, with the blight of the inner city, and the rehabilitation of the physically and mentally handicapped. These combined manpower programs represent a huge and firmly established part of the country's social services and social

---

[1] United States Department of Labor, Press Release (USDL-72-731), October 2, 1972.

TABLE I

Federal Outlays for Manpower Programs

Fiscal 1961 to 1974[a]

Fiscal Year	Total (Millions $)
1961	$ 239
1964	539
1966	1,579
1968	2,221
1970	2,568
1971	3,173
1972	4,374
1973	5,296
1974 (estimated)	4,807*

Source: United States Office of Management and Budget

[a] Outlays of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Labor, and Office of Economic Opportunity.

* Administration Budget Request. Possible reduction from Fiscal 1973 due mainly to proposed ending of Emergency Employment Assistance Program.

welfare expenditures.

The Quality of Manpower Services

In addition to the absolute growth in the manpower programs, the past decade has brought qualitative changes in the manpower "mission." The limited involvement of social work in manpower may in part reflect the limitations of the manpower program as it existed ten years ago, and the subsequent failure to recognize changes in program content. The Director of the United States Department of Labor's Office of Manpower Research, Dr. Howard Rosen, put it this way in the Department's first conference on Social Work and Manpower Programs in May 1969:

> [In 1962 we] had a rather simplistic view of how you solve manpower problems. We thought all you had to do was provide training or retraining for workers...in the six years we've learned that's not the answer. It's far more complex...We started out with a group of labor economists and now we have psychologists and sociologists and political scientists and demographers and you name it...because of the problems that have developed...[1]

Social Workers?

The major target population of the expanded manpower programs is now the marginal part of the labor force which suffers a competitive employability disadvantage. A decade ago, emphasis was on the labor market needs of white high school graduates and established labor force participants. Now attention is focused on "the disadvantaged" and the "hard core" under-employed and unemployed; persons with relatively low educational achievement, little skill training and/or experience in employment; and those suffering from a variety of socioeconomic disabilities--ghetto and minority youth, the older worker, the welfare mother, the delinquent, the addict or ex-addict, the ex-offender, the minority worker.

---

[1] Dr. Howard Rosen, transcript, "Social Work Research Conference on Manpower Programs," United States Department of Labor, Warrenton, Virginia, May 20, 1969, p. 7.

Planning and programming for manpower has increasingly been based on the recognition that there is "segmentation" in the labor market--a dual labor market in which a large and fairly distinct part of the population faces barriers to effective participation. Such a view is of particular relevance to the role of social work, since it faces the fact that there is a labor force "underclass" that is societally and structurally disadvantaged; that the labor market includes socioeconomic factors that go far beyond ordinary "labor economics" and simple job matching to the areas of expertise of the social work professional.

This new and demanding quality in the manpower system is reflected in the 1970 Employment and Manpower Act (vetoed by President Nixon on December 16, 1970) which listed the following as the "Comprehensive Manpower Services" to be made available to program participants.

1. Basic education, including literacy and communications skills...

2. A program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training...

3. Outreach to find the discouraged and undermotivated and encourage and assist them to enter employment or programs designed to improve their employability...

4. Pre-vocational orientation to introduce those of limited experience to improve their employability...

5. Supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs...including health care services, counseling, day care for children, bonding, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs...

6. Special job development efforts to solicit job opportunities suited to the abilities of the disadvantaged...

7. Job coaching for a limited period to assist the employer and the worker to insure job retention...

The congeniality of manpower services to professional social work is evident in these legislative directives. Another illustration is contained in the "Human Resources Employability Development Model" designed by the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor to help the disadvantaged function effectively in the labor market, and described as:

> a flexible, yet systematic approach to improve manpower and supportive services delivered to assist an individual to become job-ready. Central to the model is the employability development team (EDT)--a group of individuals responsible for a limited caseload of enrollees during their enrollment in the program. The team provides--or assures that others provide--a full range of manpower services including outreach; enrollment; orientation; appraisal; counseling; referral to training, education, and work experience; job development; placement; coaching; and follow-through. In the entire period during which these services are provided, supportive services such as day care, health care, legal aid, and transportation are made available on an as-needed basis.
>
> Each team member--counselor, work and training specialist, job developer, coach, and clerk-stenographer--brings to the total team effort his own area of expertise to aid the individual's progress toward employability. Besides working with an enrollee on an individual, one-to-one basis, team members come together for periodic case conferences to review an individual's status, refine his employability plan, and develop options for the enrollee's consideration.
>
> In conjunction with the enrollee, the team develops an employability development plan (EDP), which outlines the enrollee's short- and long-range goals, and the steps to be taken to best arrive at these goals. During the period of implementation of the plan, the team works closely with the enrollee to evaluate and assess progress, provide additional supportive services, and modify the plan.[1]

---

[1] Employability Development Model, United States Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Washington, D.C., August 1970.

It is little wonder that the Director of the United States Employment Service, Charles Odell, who sponsored this "Employability Model" was confronted by his staff comments: "You are making social workers out of us!" Similarly, the Work Incentive Program (WIN) of the public assistance program illustrates in practice the merging of social work and manpower functions and expertise. Employability determination, development, evaluation, and review are put in the center of the welfare process. Even though it's a "shot gun marriage," the welfare system and the employment service system are bound together. As noted in the report on a "Short-Term Training Program for WIN and Related Welfare Personnel," prepared by the Graduate School of Social Work at Rutgers University,

> Involved in WIN is a shift in manpower development from employer-as-client to employee-(or potential employee)-as-client, a stance in line with what is probably the most basic tenet of social work.[1]

Manpower for Manpower

A more than $5 billion human service system such as the nation's manpower program obviously needs a large and specially prepared staff. But in this case, the manpower staff has been developed in an unplanned, haphazard way. As Professor Garth L. Mangum of the National Manpower Policy Task Force has commented.

> It is interesting that federally funded manpower programs to enhance the employability of those not adequately prepared for job market competition could have continued for a full decade with so little concern for the preparation of those administering the programs...Nobody trained these staffs; they simply learned as they went and very little has subsequently been done to train qualified personnel.[2]

---

[1] "Short-Term Training Program for WIN and Related Welfare Personnel," Graduate School of Social Work, Rutgers University, December 1971, mimeographed, p. 21.

[2] John R. Niland (ed.), The Production of Manpower Specialists, Ithaca, N.Y.: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1971, Foreword, p. ix-xiii.

The first significant attention to the supply and demand for manpower specialists was provided by the "Conference on Manpower for the Manpower Field" in October 1970, organized by the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations of Cornell University, and funded by the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor.[1] The Conference papers and discussion by a group of manpower scholars and practitioners indicated that:

1. The need for manpower specialists is expected to increase steadily and greatly. The Department of Labor indicated its expectation of need for 65,000 new staff members in Employment Security Operations alone, and the Talmadge-WIN program was expected to require 20,000 new staff each year for five years.

2. No systematic knowledge base and no adequate curriculum or training process exists for the preparation of manpower specialists.

3. In this undefined and more or less accidental "manpower for manpower" process, staff has come from many varied educational routes, but the primary source has been through economics or the closely related fields of industrial relations and business administration. This overemphasis on economics reflects the initial simplistic view of the manpower process noted by Dr. Rosen earlier. Reliance on economists was seen as dysfunctional. As Professor Herbert S. Parnes, an economist from Ohio State University, put it,

> However important economics may be, a graduate degree in economics is not the best preparation for most human resource specialists and probably not even for those who wish to specialize in labor market research...especially in the light of trends in academic economics during the past decade or so, much of what is required in a typical major at the graduate level is of very little value from the standpoint of manpower policy...[2]

---

[1] Niland, op. cit.

[2] Niland, ibid., p. 89-90.

4. There is a gross underrepresentation of minority participants in manpower program staffs. Women are also underrepresented and social workers have been a most incidental source of human resource staffing.

5. Training for the manpower system should be interdisciplinary, and the curriculum should cover a wide range of the social sciences with emphasis on human behavior, political, social, and economic relations and institutions. Moreover, in a comment by Professor Mangum of special interest to social workers used to field work,

> new manpower administrators cannot be produced by "book learning" alone. Academic principles and explorations must be combined with practical on-the-job administrative experience.

All this suggests there is a need for especially trained social workers in the manpower system, and there is a great opportunity here for social work employment and contribution. This applies to all areas of practice, to branches and divisions of social work, and to B.A., M.S.W., and doctoral levels of preparation. In its introduction to its evaluation of the Department of Labor Manpower Institutional Grants Program, the National Manpower Policy Task Force stated:

> With the rapid expansion of manpower programs, and the increasing decentralization of decision-making authority, there are now and will continue to be critical shortages of manpower researchers, planners, evaluators, and administrators.
>
> The mission of the Manpower Administration is to develop human resources to meet critical needs, and there can be little argument with an investment in the educating and training of manpower specialists to alleviate existing shortages.
>
> The issue should not be <u>whether</u> but <u>how</u> this investment will be made.[1]

---

[1] "An Assessment of the Manpower Institutional Grants Program," National Manpower Policy Task Force, mimeographed, April 1972.

This general comment can be applied directly to the social work-manpower relationship: "The issue should not be whether but how this investment will be made."

THE MANPOWER CHALLENGE TO SOCIAL WORK

Eli Ginzberg
Columbia University School of Business

Introduction

Were it not that I have always had social workers on my interdisciplinary team back to the very beginnings of our research project in the late 1930's, I would be uneasy about dealing with the subject of the interfacing of manpower and social work. By way of further qualification let me point out that we are currently carrying on at the Conservation of Human Resources Project a study of work and welfare in New York City that is headed by a former graduate of your school.

Another point that bears on my personal sympathy and responsiveness to social work grows out of the role of dynamic psychology both in social work and in my own theoretical formulations dealing with the development of human resources.

On the other hand, I would be less than frank if I did not put on the table my restiveness with that part of the social work tradition that I define as a flight into psychodynamics and away from reality determinants. For example, when we studied long term unemployment in New York City in the late 1930's to early 1940's, we were shocked to find that the large voluntary agencies were no longer interested in

---

Eli Ginzberg, A. Barton Hepburn Professor of Economics at the Columbia University School of Business, is a nationally known author in the field of manpower policy and planning. He has directed the Conservation of Human Resources Project and its predecessor, based at Columbia University, for 35 years, and has been Chairman of the Department of Labor's National Manpower Advisory Committee for 12 years. Prof. Ginzberg has written many books in the field, the latest of which is New York Is Very Much Alive, published by McGraw-Hill in 1973.

making cash grants to their clients for such mundane needs as to help a man get a set of false teeth or to pay his trade union dues, actions that would have led to his reemployment. The private agencies were no longer interested in such matters; their focus had shifted over completely to personality and intra-familial dynamics.

So much by way of personal background. Now, I would like to review briefly certain critical problem areas; to explore the interfacing between manpower and social work; to illuminate some of their implications for education; and to conclude with a few broad observations about directions for the future.

Critical Problem Areas

1. The Transition From School to Work.

The first critical area relates to the transition from school to work. Although 80% of the age group in the United States completes high school, it is important to note that this ratio is very much lower in the central cities. In New York approximately two out of five young people fail to earn their high school diploma, even though one can get a diploma in New York more for good conduct than for scholastic achievement.

We know from a great many different studies that all young people face varying orders of difficulty in linking into the labor market: finding a job with training that is not dead-ended. Those who leave high school before graduation are that much more handicapped in making a successful transition into work. One of the largest sources of manpower waste, and one with ominous implications, is the tens, even hundreds, of thousands of young people who are neither students nor effective members of the labor force.

2. The Interface Between Work and Welfare.

A second manpower problem of critical importance relates to the interface between work and welfare, particularly as it bears on the large number of female-headed households, especially with young children. Although there is great restiveness both in the halls of Congress and among the American public about supporting potentially employable women on relief, the simple fact is that if they have young

children to care for, they often have no alternative. While some can make private arrangements for child care and a few are lucky enough to have access to publicly supported child care facilities, the vast majority of women on welfare are confined to their homes not because they want to be there, but because they cannot leave until their children are older or until the society decides to face up directly to the child care issue. Most of these women have, at best, limited education and modest skills. If they were to get a job it would be the kind that paid a minimum wage or just above. If they have two children to care for, they would be unable, even if they worked full-time, to make ends meet in a high cost area such as New York City. In short, if society really wants to move large numbers of mothers off welfare it will have to solve two knotty issues, the child care problem and the income supplementation problem. Unless it finds solutions to both, it cannot succeed in reducing welfare loads significantly.

3. The Federal Effort to Create Jobs.

A third problem area relates to the role of the Emergency Employment Act, that is, the federal effort to create jobs for at least a small proportion of the unemployed. The first point to note is its modest scale. With appropriations of about $1 billion and with a per-year cost of $7,000, only a small proportion of the 5 million persons who are unemployed can be included in this program. The second point is that a great number of different groups are supposed to be served. The President has stressed the importance of giving priority to returning servicemen whose unemployment rate is distressingly high. Some communities have used Emergency Employment Act funds to reemploy local officials who were let go because of financial stringency. And there are many who believe that the primary thrust of the Emergency Employment Act, as of all manpower programs, should be the more seriously handicapped who cannot make it into productive employment on their own.

4. Job Retention by Manpower Program Graduates.

Most of the manpower planning during the 1960's, surely after 1963, has been directed to the hard-to-employ by providing them with preemployment experiences, institutional training, on-the-job training, and a variety of other labor market

supports. While our knowledge of the effectiveness of these programs leaves a great deal to be desired, we do know that a high proportion of the persons trained and placed in employment failed to stay in their original job for any considerable time. If manpower programs have employability as their major goal, then clearly the finding that so many who were trained fail to keep their jobs, at least with their initial employer, must be considered in future programming.

But the matter is not simple. I recently reviewed a carefully controlled study by one large automobile manufacturer which showed very poor retention of jobs by men who were hired and outstanding success with respect to women, all of whom had previously been on welfare.

5. The Extent of Illicit and Illegal Work.

The fifth critical issue that I want to comment on is the extent to which the income-work nexus has been broken. Another way of formulating this is to call attention to the importance of illicit and illegal work. In a recent study that the Conservation Project completed--Unemployment in the Urban Core by Stanley Friedlander (Praeger)--there is an estimate that perhaps as many as 250,000 persons in New York City earn all or part of their income from illicit or illegal work. A black economist who knows the ghetto well believes that this is an underestimate.

But that is not all. The administrator of the Human Resources Administration estimates that there are about 200,000 people on welfare in New York City who are employable. What he did not say, but what I will add, is that many of these people earn some money on the side. Then there is another group in New York whose presence in the city is in violation of the laws--that of illegal immigrants. In our recently published work, New York Is Very Much Alive, my colleague Dale Hiestand estimated that there are 200,000 such illegal immigrants currently working in the city.

New York City is a big labor market with about 3.5 million people, but I have just accounted for a significant minority, namely, for about one in six.

Even this brief review of five critical issues in the manpower arena should have helped to make clear that social work has a role to play in the analysis and solution of the more important of the nation's manpower problems.

Interfacing

Let me now call your attention to some important interfacing between manpower and social work based on the problem areas that we have just reviewed.

In discussing the potential shift of mothers from welfare to employment we noted that the conditions under which people live may constrain their ability to work and earn their living. We considered primarily the question of child care but we could have gone on to raise a host of related problems such as housekeeping services for a homebound dependent, access to transportation, remedial health care, and many other work-linked factors.

A second interfacing can be subsumed under the term "employment support." When people have little or no experience in the labor force and a range of handicaps, the question of supporting them during a transitional period can be of critical importance. Jesse Gordon of the University of Michigan studied the experience of one form of support, counseling, and found that it could be more effective for many of the seriously disadvantaged if it were provided after they started to work, rather than before.

While we think of the community as one arena and the work place as another, the simple truth is that the two are often linked and that conflicts in one are reflected in conflicts in the other. When racial tensions become exacerbated the conflict situation cannot be contained but is likely to spill over. There is evidence that this has occurred repeatedly in plants in the Detroit area. There is, therefore, little prospect of a long term resolution of the employment problems of minorities unless the majority learns to live as well as to work alongside the minority.

We have not paid enough attention to the fact that a large number of people are forcibly institutionalized in prisons, reformatories, mental hospitals, and that a considerable number of them are discharged every year and must make their way back into society. The longer they have been institution-

alized, the more difficult their return. Since employers are skittish about hiring ex-criminals and ex-mental patients, a failure on the part of the community to build special bridges and provide special assistance is likely to lead to renewed dysfunctional behavior and re-institutionalization.

The fifth and final interfacing that warrants attention has to do with the increasing movement that occurs among school, training, and work, flows in several directions at the same time. Many people have need for assistance in deciding which way to move at a particular time; in identifying the work or training institution that best fits short and longer term plans.

Ours has been a society which has long looked to the individual, with some assistance from his family, to make whatever moves he finds necessary. What the foregoing has suggested is that many individuals need help in making such moves.

Implications for Social Work Education

Having put before you a selected number of critical manpower issues and some of the interfacing problems that exist in contemporary American society my task if now to draw out the implications of this analysis for social work education.

My first finding is perhaps the most important. Social work education must pay attention to the role of work in modern society and take pains to see that all students, no matter what their area of specialization may be, have some understanding of the critical role of work and the many conflicts that arise in the work arena. For those who enter graduate schools of social work with relatively little or no training in the social sciences I would urge that at a minimum they be exposed to economics and sociology with enough institutional content to gain some familiarity with problems of work and income. Although I might be accused of special pleading, there is something to be said for social work schools offering at least one basic course in human resources and manpower.

For those who go through schools of social work preparing themselves for managerial or planning positions I would place heavy stress on their exposure to the following:

The elementary and intermediate level tools of economics.

A second order competence in statistical methodology.

Some sensitivity to social legislation, including its public finance aspects.

A course in human resources and manpower.

For those who look forward to working in, or close to, the manpower arena, there is much to be said also for an internship in a manpower program, such as WIN, Neighborhood Youth Corps, or the State Employment Service.

Concluding Observations

While there is no ground for optimism about federal support for manpower in general or for social work training in particular, there is also no reason for extreme pessimism. As I read the Washington scene, the flow of funds will be reduced, but they will not be eliminated and the amount of money available will still be considerable even if it will be less than we had become accustomed to.

No one can study the labor market without being impressed with the fact that there is a high order of mobility built into different types of training, particularly in new areas such as manpower. From this I conclude that even if schools of social work move energetically to strengthen the role of manpower in their curriculum, as I hope and expect that they will, the students going through these programs must recognize that successful completion does not guarantee them a good job. They will be competing with a great many others who may have gone through equally good and even better programs--in economics, management, sociology, political science.

To complicate matters, the largest number of jobs in the manpower arena are in the Employment Service and they are distinguished by low salaries. All the other jobs in the manpower arena together do not equal the number of jobs in the Employment Service. To complicate matters even further, most of the better jobs in the Employment Service are obtained by promotion from within. Persons with masters degrees or doctorates in social work are really precluded from competing.

Another dimension that warrants attention is the fact that we are on the verge of a change in federal-state relations which will shift the locus of responsibility from Washington to the states and localities in the design and management of manpower programs. I would anticipate that this will lead to even more political determination at the local level with less opportunity for the specialist to have a clearly defined role.

But there may be a silver lining in this shift toward decentralization. With most of the $1.5 billion of federal manpower funding a year being decentralized to the states and localities there will be a considerable number of senior managerial positions that have to be filled if the states and localities are to perform their missions effectively. There may be good opportunities here for well-trained, sensitive administrators.

One concluding comment. I have observed social work over the years and I have been impressed by what it has to offer to the community in the planning and implementation of various human resources programs. But I have also been impressed that its effectiveness has been much reduced by its preoccupation with professional issues that are of great concern to the insiders but of little or no importance to the outsiders. I would therefore strongly urge social work leadership to relax, and exploit the new opportunities that manpower programming offers and to stop wasting its resources on intraprofessional preoccupations.

SOCIAL WORK AND MANPOWER--A VEILED INTERFACE

Joseph L. Vigilante
Adelphi University School of Social Work

Recent History

Although social work has always had some interest in work as a social instrument, its most recent direct involvement in manpower began in the early '60's. The 1961 and 1962 Amendments to the Social Security Act established in what was then the Bureau of Family Services of HEW, the Community Work and Training Program (CW&T). This program was the first involvement of the federal government in funding work and training programs for public welfare clients since the 1930's. Departments of public welfare were forced to come face to face with the world of work.

The Community Work and Training Program, established and under way by 1962, was quickly followed in public welfare by Title V, (The Work Experience) of the Economic Opportunity Act, operational by 1965. Through CW&T and Title V, HEW established national standards for work training. The standards mandated a variety of supportive social services: provision of family counseling, day care, homemaker services, medical, psychiatric, and child welfare services. In Title V, purposeful, planned integration between manpower services and social services was required.

By 1966, in selected Title V projects throughout the country some rather sophisticated manpower programs for public welfare clients were developing. There were, for example, day care services on the training sites, group counseling for wives of

---

Joseph L. Vigilante is Dean of the Adelphi University School of Social Work. He teaches "Economics, Politics, and the Sociology of Poverty" in the Manpower Development Program at the New School for Social Research. He has had a long-time interest in the involvement of social workers in the manpower field and wrote his doctoral dissertation on the subject, "Work and Welfare."

of trainees, family counseling in regard to the intra-family problems created when one of two parents was in a training program. Social workers from departments of welfare and public employment counselors saw the work and training program both in Title V and WINS as exciting and stimulating departures from what they had grown to experience as routine and hopeless kinds of activities.

The switch from Title V to WINS and the removal of primary responsibility from Welfare to the Labor Department necessitated administrative retooling. There resulted (at that time) an operational de-emphasis of the social service components in the work and training programs. The lessons that had been learned were not used in the switch from one federal department to the other. But social workers were beginning to see evidence of the employability potential of a group about which they had never been optimistic. Social workers by that time had begun to learn about the social and human value of work itself. The employment services were to begin to learn about the importance of individualized social services in employability development.

Commonalities Between Social Work and Manpower

At the present stage of the relationship between manpower and social work, given the existence of the dual labor market, the fundamental commonality between both is the client group. Social workers are intimately acquainted with the labor underclass. The manpower field is learning about it. This mutual identification around the client reveals a mutual problem. For concentration on the underclass in the labor market has encouraged a residual approach to manpower problems and keeps us away from a prevention and enhancement function in the manpower field. To put it crassly, with a few exceptions, the manpower programs of the 1960's and '70's have produced dead end jobs. Limited job mobility for trainees is in large measure due to labor market constraints, but it is not unrelated to social policies and the limited capacities of personnel administering the programs. Manpower programs have not made maximum use of available knowledge and experience in working with people.

Related to this phenomenon is a second characteristic of both fields; a primary concern for the most obviously disadvantaged.

Social and political priorities have forced us to focus on this group. Indeed, social workers, in a perhaps appropriate display of guilt for their blindness to poverty before the '60's, have been upbraiding themselves and reorganizing their practice and educational institutions to correct the error. Manpower has swung from primary concern for the cream of the unemployed (in the first MDTA programs) to a more socially appropriate concern for the disadvantaged unemployed.

Planning for the disadvantaged seems to have thrust manpower programs more predominantly into the public sector. Because of the half-hearted response of private employers, manpower has turned to public service careers for the disadvantaged.

But aside from the fact that social institutions (including professional groups), which are almost exclusively concerned with the poor, may be doomed to oblivion, it seems to me that a truly serious manpower program as well as a national social service program must involve the private sector as well as the not-for-profit sector. A false separation between labor needs of private industry and public services results from planning primarily for the latter. The public sector is doubly stigmatized when it is both the planned sector and the planning sector.

An example of the potential for an alliance between manpower and social work in the private sector can be illustrated by reference to a program at American Telephone and Telegraph under "Jobs 70." Personnel people at AT&T are struggling to provide the following opportunities for trainees: orientation, special counseling, supervisory and human relations training, job-related education, English as a second language, on-the-job and vestibule training, supportive services including medical-dental, child care and day care, and transportation.

If manpower planning is to be effective, it must include a concern with national manpower distribution. This suggests, therefore, the development, and operationalizing of systems to deal with local and regional labor shortages and/or labor surpluses, including the provision of incentives for workers to move to new areas, or to change skills, or to provide incentives to bring industry into areas where there is a surplus of unemployment. If one views manpower in this manner, the social implications loom as high as the economic implications, e.g. moving of families, provision of family

supports, and development of educational, social, and health services related to labor deployment.

The academic community too is making gestures in the direction of more sophisticated manpower development for the private sector. The Industrial Social Welfare Center at the Columbia University School of Social Work represents such a move, as do programs at Marywood College, Scranton, Pennsylvania, and the graduate program in manpower development at the New School for Social Research.

Just as manpower programs have placed greater emphasis on the public service market as a target, education for manpower (like education for social work) tends to prepare students for employment in the not-for-profit sector. This trend, in my view, will only further encapsulate manpower outside of the economic mainstream, a position familiar to social workers, and detrimental to both their professional status and their ability to serve a wider range of people in need.

Both social work and manpower as professional disciplines are in a position to attract large numbers of representatives of minority groups. As a result of the government sponsored manpower programs, revitalized interests in working for one's own ethnic group and (until recently) a fairly open job market, candidates for both social work and manpower education have come quite often from "underclass" backgrounds themselves. Except for rare occasions, graduates of Ivy League institutions (status institutions) do not apply to schools of social work, nor will they apply to graduate programs in manpower. This suggests opportunities for applying the experiences of social work education to manpower in developing specialized knowledge with respect to admission processes, curriculum development, special student needs, educational funding, and job placement.

Differences

Manpower still enjoys greater status today with the federal government and among many public and private institutions than does social work. Work objectives for poor people are not viewed as coddling or permissive. On the other hand, social work, as a result of 70 years on the campus, tends to be better accepted within the academic and professional disciplines in the society. The social work route may

therefore provide a more direct access to professional recognition for manpower workers.

The body of knowledge in the education of social workers has tended to be more "applied" than theoretical; more reliance upon laboratory "method" than traditional study. At least three-fifths of the professional curriculum is devoted to field instruction and on-campus methods courses. Manpower education tends to rely more on academic social sciences content. An examination of the tasks in which manpower practitioners are engaged strongly suggests the need for courses in methods of working with people--how to identify the relationship between personal and social problems and how to involve clients in problem-solving are examples. In addition, the social worker's training in human growth and behavior, social policy, and social welfare organization should provide an important asset to a rapidly expanding manpower field.

Contributions and Benefits--An Exchange

If manpower workers are to develop the skills needed to assist in the interaction between people with problems and work, they will have to concentrate equally upon "how to do" as well as "what to know." They will need a full understanding of both personality and social theory, built on a humanistic value base. They will have to know how to relate in a professional manner, how to listen, how to understand, how to convey a sense of understanding to the client, and how to skillfully assist the client throughout the process of exploring, testing, and expanding his work potential.

Social workers over the years have accumulated a fairly extensive knowledge about service delivery. Certainly, we haven't done the perfect job in this area but we do have a knowledge of the organizational structure, and complicated functions of public service systems. We have experiential knowledge of the relationships between the public and private (non-profit) sectors of the economy, we have been immersed in understanding, developing and using social services. Our profession has been, perhaps, too much obsessed with professional systems and interlocking professional networks for service; but given a possible overemphasis in this area, we may be able to offer something

to a new and inexperienced field. In this regard, I would underscore the importance of community organization as a useful component in manpower systems development.

Social work has also had a parallel involvement with the middle and upper-middle classes. Social workers' experiences with social agency boards of directors, for example, have given them access to the private system and the special, if not peculiar, characteristics of upper-middle class decision-making. Its knowledge and experience with middle class decision-makers also can be useful in an expanded manpower field.

From the educational dimension, social work has had to transpose direct practice experience to a conceptual level, to make it transmissible for teaching purposes. I am referring here to what Alfred Kadushin has identified as social work's own body of knowledge in comparison to "borrowed knowledge."[1] Manpower as a field of practice lends itself well to the inductive processes which social work theorists have used in conceptualizing practice experience for teaching.

Benefits that social work can get from manpower--which might well be used to infuse the social work curriculum--are the concepts of the meaning and value of work in this society; precise examination of the fatuous generalizations about both work and leisure time, knowledge of the entire manpower system and work system (including employment counseling and rehabilitation counseling), the significance of labor and labor unions as social institutions in the United States and their contributions or hindrances to manpower programming; job development concepts, job testing instruments, the nature of first line supervision, in industry as compared with supervision in the social welfare agencies--and the important distinctions between the two.

Whether for purposes of enabling more involvement in manpower or to increase our capabilities for working in other expanded service systems, social workers need to learn a lot about demography and the handling of masses of data through automated systems. These are familiar to the manpower field.

---

[1] Alfred Kadushin, "Knowledge Base of Social Work," in Issues in American Social Work, A.J. Kahn, ed., New York: Columbia University Press, 1959, pp. 39-79.

Social workers who have had opportunities to see data collection, organization and retrieval systems in the United States Labor Department, for example, have looked into the top of an exotic boutique of potential information data systems for both manpower and social services planning.

A closer linkage with manpower operations may also bring to social workers another dimension for analyzing our own educational dilemmas. I refer here to the application of systems theory to curriculum development. If nothing else, it's quicker than the committee process.

Social work can bring something special to research in the manpower field, namely, the relationship between work and the dynamics of family life or family life styles. What does work as a social instrument do to family life? In respect to long-term dependent families, who have not experienced work as a part of the life style, what does required work do to roles? Do family role networks change and as a function of work? What impact does this have on <u>family</u> functioning?

We will need in social work to introduce academic content in macro-economics and political science (not just political theory), and, of course, we will need to develop field instruction work placements in manpower settings, both in direct service and in planning.

The dilemmas we have faced in social work education will be exacerbated as we link into manpower.

The problem of relationship between on-campus, academic education and applied education (field instruction) is one which manpower educators face today and one with which we have long experience. A decision in the early '20's put a heavy emphasis on applied knowledge. The decision is viewed by some as having been historically unfortunate. But as the current debate suggests, there is still no general agreement.

Another question is at which educational level certain tasks should be taught. John Niland has stated that direct service in manpower should be taught at the undergraduate level. It is coincidental that many educators today are saying the same for social work. The concept of a continuum in education, of

recent vintage in social work education, addresses itself to this question. What should be the entry requirements? At what levels ought there be entry? What should be the faculty qualifications? How do we recruit? Whom do we recruit?

I am suggesting that those questions which have plagued social work over the years might be clarified within the context of education for manpower. I believe this because the goals in manpower are more precise, more definitive, and perhaps easier to measure than have been the usual goals of social work practice removed from manpower concerns.

Many of those who have built curricula for the manpower field have emphasized the necessity for interdisciplinary approaches. The demands and the needs of the manpower system (based upon the concept of a dual labor market) strongly suggest that social work would be and should be a significant part of this interdisciplinary effort. If one also includes private sector needs, the interdisciplinary base for manpower education and practice becomes even wider.

The time is right for the involvement of social work with manpower, not only because of the expanding market in the manpower field but also because social work education itself is undergoing major curriculum revisions. As we question what kind of social work should be offered at the undergraduate level, at the masters and doctoral level, and as we revise our curricula at these various levels to encompass new goals for social work education, we have an excellent opportunity to examine manpower education.

I think there is an opportunity now for a pooling of resources. We are at a veiled interface, each field vaguely perceiving the outlines of attraction in the other. We need to lift the veils.

TOWARDS A NEW EMPLOYMENT STRATEGY: ONE CITY'S VIEW

Lucille Rose
New York City Department of Employment

We in the Department of Employment have designed a comprehensive manpower development and employment strategy for meeting the employment needs of both public assistance eligible and non-public assistance eligible segments of the city's low-income work force.

Implementation of this strategy entails a new program approach and a major redirection of agency resources toward the accomplishment of four policy goals:

1. the placement of low-income, unemployed persons in regular, stable employment as a first and absolute priority, so long as private sector jobs are available; and the expansion of public service employment opportunities in the public and non-profit sectors only when there are not enough opportunities in the regular economy;

2. the creation of jobs in the public and non-profit sectors for the chronically unemployed, those unable to secure competitive jobs in the regular economy;

3. the provision of training, not as an alternative to employment, but as an adjunct to at least half-time participation in employment, when it is necessary to bring an individual to a skills level sufficient to enhance or maintain his employability;

Lucille Rose, Deputy Administrator/Commissioner of the Department of Employment of the Human Resources Administration in New York City, heads a recently created department which is one of the first in the country to develop employment services at the municipal level. She helped to develop its predecessor, the Manpower and Career Development Agency, one of the original components of New York City's anti-poverty program.

4. the establishment of a single administrative structure designed to optimize the use of the city's monies for training and employment programs; and the development of a single field system of comprehensive, integrated centers for the delivery of manpower services.

We are attempting to deal rationally and realistically with the problem of chronic unemployment within an urban economic environment characterized by: a substantial reduction in the amount of federal funds available for training, educational and work experience programs; dwindling market demand for unskilled labor; a plethora of individuals whose skills level is non-existent or insufficient to qualify them for existing jobs in the regular economy; and increased pressure on employable public assistance eligibles to seek jobs in the competitive market.

The dimensions of this unemployment problem will be familiar to most of you here today, concerned as you are with the problems of cities. Active unemployment in New York City has hovered at a level much above 200,000 people for more than two years. An unknown number of workers are now inactively unemployed, that is, they have stopped looking for work because of their perception of their chances in the current market. Of the city's total unemployed, an estimated 70,000 employable adults, family heads and single adults, are now receiving public assistance; approximately 30,000 employable rehabilitated addicts are currently receiving Aid to Disabled. Additionally, among the unemployed in this city are 35,000 veterans. Hardest hit among the low-income unemployed are those populations eligible for the Department of Employment's current programs as well as those eligible for the Department of Social Service's income maintenance and service programs.

Strategies to place this population directly in available jobs have met with failure. A case in point is the massive New York State Work Relief Program, operated through the New York State Employment Service, which was unable to place more than 4% of the population of 30,000 public assistance employables referred to the program during the first year. In addition, statistics obtained from NYSES reveal that 26% of all those referred claimed to be unemployable. Such strategies assume that stable jobs are available for which

most of the population involved can compete. The meager performance of such programs only delineates the fallacy of their strategic assumptions in light of the current market--a market which has experienced a decrease of 252,000 blue-collar, entry level jobs for unskilled laborers in the manufacturing industries, a market in which there is currently little or no demand for the unskilled, under-educated recipient of public assistance although the system has found him medically employable and required he report bi-monthly to the New York State Employment Service for private sector job referral and placement.

On the other hand, strategies which rely heavily on training as the means for moving the unemployed low-income population into competitive employment have also performed far less than satisfactorily under current conditions. The population eligible for training requires extensive educational remediation as a prerequisite for job-related training. Coupled institutional skills and related education training programs such as those operated by the WIN program and MCDA have failed because:

* they have tried, within too limited a period of time, to narrow the education and skills gap to put employment opportunities paying sufficient income within reach of this population;

* they have failed to consider how those for whom the gap is being closed will be able to compete for regular employment with those who are not similarly handicapped.

The high drop-out rate experienced by the WIN and MCDA training programs has confirmed our belief that no training program designed for responsible adults can succeed, if it is presented as an alternative to employment. Attendance rates can be increased only if appropriate rewards are supplied. The only effective reward for participation in training is employment.

Given the employment conditions in New York City, and the level of competitive employability of the city's low-income work force, neither a direct placement nor training strategy by themselves, but a combination of the two--namely, on-the-job training and subsidized employment--is an appropriate training direction.

Hence, it is based on an understanding of the current market and its ability to absorb the city's unemployed employables, that the Department of Employment has determined the following program strategy to deal directly with the problem of unemployment within the low-income work force:

* a direct job placement function administered in conjunction with the New York State Employment Service to screen and place that segment of the population who are structurally unemployed, but potentially ready for immediate placement in competitive employment;

* through payments issued to employers, the provision of on-the-job training wherever possible to employ that segment for whom only a marginal adaptation need be made to render them job-ready;

* to the extent financing is available, the placement of persons who cannot be placed in competitive employment in public service jobs funded through diverted public assistance monies and funds available through other government budgets;

* and, finally, cutting across all three of these programs the placement in training and educational programs of persons participating in employment in order to upgrade their skills level and to enable them to earn an income sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living relative to the rest of the population.

Toward the implementation of this strategy, we in the Department of Employment have proposed the following programs.

The primary function and responsibility of the Department is to meet the employment needs of the unemployed low-income population of the city. Given that mandate, we propose an employment program enlightened by the following assumptions, which form its basic underlying framework: that the most appropriate manpower development prescription for marginally employable persons is employment itself; that the expenditure of public resources to finance employment is more effective to the restoration of employables to self-support and self-

sufficiency than current cash assistance programs; and that the public and private non-profit sectors can absorb and utilize substantial numbers of employables to provide basic public services to community residents.

In illustration of the above policy in action, let me speak briefly about the Work Relief Employment Project (WREP), which will be ready for implementation within a matter of days. The program will provide a minimum of half-time public service employment in public and private, non-profit agencies for up to 20,000 Home Relief eligible single adults and heads of households without children, for whom jobs cannot be located in the private sector; perform on-going job development activities in the private sector; refer job-ready WREP participants in private sector jobs as these become available; provide institutional skills training and education to project participants who have been enrolled in the program for three months; and finance on-the-job training within employing agencies and organizations. Money to project participants will be paid in the form of payroll rather than relief checks. The work environment will be that of a real job.

Another example of progressive public policy in action is the supported work program, which will provide full-time or half-time jobs in public and private non-profit agencies as rehabilitation for 4,000 addicts enrolled in or completing addiction treatment and eligible for Aid to the Disabled.

Additionally, the Department is about to propose to the State Legislature a legislative amendment that would finance a program of on-the-job training for participants in public service employment.

With its emphasis on job creation, elimination of service duplication among public agencies, and meeting income needs through employment, our new manpower strategy will work dramatic changes in the training program:

* To the extent that financing is available for public service employment, training will be provided only to persons who are employed in public service jobs or in the regular economy.

* Training will be scheduled on a part-time basis during both day and evening hours to complement the client's work schedule.

* Curriculum development will be job-specific and only that training which will immediately upon completion qualify the enrollee for an identifiable job will be financed.

* Discussions have been initiated with the Board of Education concerning the restructuring of their educational program and their assumption of responsibility for the administration of pre-vocational training.

The goal of the new manpower services program is placement in self-supporting competitive employment. Placement in jobs in the regular economy will be an absolute priority for all program participants. Only those persons unable to be placed in competitive employment or on-the-job training will be referred to public service employment. Training will be provided for those engaged in public service or private employment.

In order to avoid the fragmentation and inefficiency which have existed among systems reponsible for the delivery of manpower services, and to promote continuity in service delivery to the city's low-income population, we propose a single, integrated field system for service delivery, to be called the Comprehensive Manpower System.

Within this system client-applicants will be recruited through direct linkages with community agencies serving the low-income population. Direct referrals will be made from the DSS income maintenance centers, the Neighborhood Manpower Service Centers and addiction treatment programs throughout the city to Comprehensive Manpower Centers (CMCs), within which the functions of manpower services assessment and referral, income assessment and disbursement, and supportive services assessment and referral are housed.

Regular job placement services for the unemployed and underemployed will be provided by the Neighborhood Manpower Service Centers, by the New York State Employment Service and by the Comprehensive Manpower Centers.

Screening for income, medical and program eligibility will

occur within the income maintenance centers and Comprehensive Manpower Centers.

The Comprehensive Manpower Centers will provide a full range of manpower and employment related services including: private sector job placement, eligibility assessment, medical assessment, testing, disbursement of cash assistance, and a case management function which includes referrals to transitional public service employment, referrals to training and referrals to supportive services.

The Comprehensive Manpower System has two distinguishing features: the integration of institutional resources and the case management system.

Integration of institutional resources will be accomplished through the outstationing of income maintenance staff in the Comprehensive Manpower Center to determine income and program eligibility; the co-location of NYSES and Department of Employment staff, on a pilot project basis, in at least one of the Comprehensive Manpower Centers; and direct, on-site access to the NYSES computerized job bank in at least one of the Comprehensive Manpower Centers.

The case management system has been developed in recognition of the need to provide to all clients continuity in the provision of services. A single case manager will be responsible for coordinating all information on a particular client. Supported by a computerized client tracking system, he will have access to the client's record and profile, containing demographic data, household status, family status, income and earnings data, employment status, availability status and program status. Having complete access to job bank information, he will be aware of the availability of slots and job openings and can explore with the client all program options for which he is eligible.

The foregoing has, I believe, presented in capsule a summary of our program goals and strategies. You will agree with me that to translate policy into program requires manpower. I want to direct your attention now to a consideration of our staffing needs.

Pursuit of the specific policies and programs outlined above

will require the expertise of four major categories of staff: management professionals (including manpower development specialists, urban planners, economists, human resource planners, etc.); social work professionals; community service professionals, paraprofessionals; and clerical support staff.

Management professionals, whose background includes extensive experience in manpower development, planning and resource allocation, fiscal administration, etc. are needed to staff all divisions within the Department of Employment:

* in the Division of Programs, to develop recommendations as to the specific population groups to be served by the Department and the ordering of priorities for serving each; to develop recommendations as to resource requirements, design and content of programs to serve various population groups; and to develop recommendations as to how the Department's programs are to be implemented.

* in the Division of Administration and Contract Services, to perform budget administration, fiscal monitoring, personnel administration and staff development within the Department.

* in the Division of Training and Supportive Services, to develop and manage the Department's citywide and regional contracts for training; to certify training agents or vendors for individual purchase of service training contracts; to develop training programs for participants in subsidized public service employment; to establish training standards and schedules; and to develop training curricula.

* in the Division of Employment Programs, to develop, implement and monitor employment programs in the public, private and non-profit sectors; and to perform the labor market analysis and job development, the contract development and monitoring necessary to program development in each of the three sectors.

* in the Office of Management Information Systems, to develop and maintain the Department's automated and manual information systems, quality control and employee productivity programs; and to develop long-range systems plans for Departmental programs and objectives.

Social work professionals are needed specifically to manage and operate the new field system for manpower service delivery detailed above. Within the system's case management unit, we hope to employ social workers as case managers, responsible for developing a complete employability plan for each client and for piloting a client through the employment and services process.

To perform this function, we are looking for social workers whose academic or experiential background includes a knowledge of labor market economics, as well as social psychology, sociology, and other disciplines which consider the behavior of people in groups and the laws that affect them.

We want to recruit professionals and paraprofessionals from community service organizations to help us to assess client service needs and the best ways to provide them. We see these individuals as vital links in our client field system for recruitment and outreach functions as well.

In conclusion, let me add that the massive staff development necessary to get our programs off the ground depends largely upon the academic community. We will be looking toward that community to supply us with individuals whose skills can meet the demands of the jobs which need doing here in the Department of Employment.

TRENDS IN NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICIES, PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND STAFFING NEEDS

Davis A. Portner
United States Department of Labor

States and localities will be soon gaining a significant new role in helping to determine the orientation, allocation of funds, and clientele of national manpower programs to be administered in their jurisdictions.

The drive toward program decentralization and decategorization, or "manpower revenue sharing," is part of the Administration's continuing effort to strengthen decision-making at the state and local levels and to coordinate the use of available funds with local labor market requirements. This combination of decentralization and decategorization of programs is designed to tailor manpower activities to area labor market conditions and to the needs of an area's target population.

In keeping with this administrative thrust, the principal trend in manpower activities in Fiscal 1974 will be the development of a comprehensive manpower delivery system at the local level. These new delivery models will bring existing manpower programs and delivery systems under local direction and control by combining most programs operating in an area into a single grant under the sponsorship of the mayor, county executive, or other elected officials. The governor will assume sponsorship for portions of a state which lie outside local manpower revenue sharing jurisdictions. The planning and consolidation of activities that must precede the execution of such unified grants will take place through Fiscal 1974, and the majority of labor market areas should be operating within the revenue sharing configuration by the year's end.

Davis A. Portner is Director of the Office of Policy Development, Planning, and Evaluation for the Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor. He has also served as Assistant Administrator of the United States Department of Commerce. As a professional economist, he has specialized in manpower and industrial economics and held positions in state and regional offices as well as in Washington.

Existing manpower legislation provides the authority and administrative initiatives for moving into the revenue sharing design and away from the single-purpose program concept toward a consolidated service approach. The impetus toward consolidation of programs and coordinated delivery of services was visible as long ago as 1967, when amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act called for the administration of four programs authorized by the act by one sponsor at the local level. Other moves in the same direction included the creation of the Concentrated Employment Program and the Work Incentive Program as manpower systems, each offering a continuum of services to a particular target group of manpower clients.

In 1971, the proposed Manpower Revenue Sharing Act was sent to Congress as one of the special revenue sharing programs. That proposal would have given wide discretion to state and local governments in determining the use of manpower funds flowing into their jurisdictions so that services could be tailored to fit the specific needs of the area. Although the proposal was not enacted into law, the principle of revenue sharing has been adopted through the General Revenue Sharing Act of 1972, a move which has increased local elected officials' awareness of the potential influence they can exert over federal programs operating within their political jurisdiction, even under existing law.

The Manpower Administration has taken several steps within the limits of existing legislative and administrative authority to increase the involvement of local officials in the planning and operation of manpower programs. The first such step was the funding of about 1,200 manpower planning staff positions under state and local elected officials. The second was redesign of the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) to place each state and local committee (now termed a Manpower Planning Council) clearly under the aegis of state and local officials. The third step, initiated in 1972, was the development of pilot comprehensive manpower projects under the authority of local elected officials in a few test areas.

Programs that will be included in the comprehensive revenue sharing model are many of those funded under the Economic Opportunity Act and the Manpower Development and Training

Act. The Work Incentive Program may be incorporated into the local manpower revenue sharing program packages, when it is clearly desirable to do so and such arrangements can be effected. Ideally, the wide array of manpower activities in the Manpower Planning Council areas should be included under the comprehensive umbrella, but local variations in the extent of control exercised by the prime sponsor are to be expected. At a minimum, before its approval, each area comprehsnsive plan will be expected to indicate clearly what working relationships have been established with other programs operating locally and with the public employment service.

As to the question of numbers of personnel and the types of skills needed for administration of manpower programs in the 1970's, our Office of Research and Development has funded a number of studies addressed to this topic. Grant recipients have included Columbia University. I leave to the academicians the subject of precise curriculum content requisite to development of a manpower development specialist. But I can give you an overview of our program staffing experience to date, and our best estimates for the future.

As to numbers of personnel needed under the Manpower Revenue Sharing approach, let me mention a few factors which will undoubtedly affect these requirements. Planning staff for given localities will vary depending on the quality of management skills already available or obtainable by the elected officials. Some localities will stress basic education, some will favor skill training, and some will advocate public employment. Some localities will discard expensive programs in favor of less costly ones which can serve greater numbers. Studies have disclosed that it takes one-half as many professional practitioners for JOBS as for institutional type training. Accordingly, the types of programs selected for emphasis will be a major factor. We anticipate that some prime sponsors will practice frugality since under the MRS approach they will be "spending their own dollars." How much duplication presently exists in current programs is not known. Whether most sponsors will make major efforts to eliminate the fat and effect reduction by project consolidation, and other measures, or whether we can develop a sufficiently sophisticated monitoring system to see that it is done, remains to be seen.

There are several resources available to us to make personnel projection estimates.

One is a study conducted under our suspices by the Bureau of Social Science Research of operational staff engaged in manpower contracts funded as of May 1970. A second resource was the FY 1972 experience of the pilot Comprehensive Manpower Program in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The last resource reviewed was our planning grants program to the governors and mayors instituted several years ago but expanded in FY 1972.

On the basis of such analyses, one may arrive at a staffing estimate for FY 1974 of roughly 50,000 positions. Replacement turnover would probably average 2.5 to 3.0% per year.

On the question of potential use of public employment programs in an active manpower policy, the administration does not favor continuing those programs authorized by the Emergency Employment Act in 1971. The basis for this position is that the EEA was an emergency and counter-cyclical measure when unemployment was at the 6% level. Since that time unemployment has declined; private sector jobs have increased; and the ability of local government to meet demand for public services has improved. Moreover, most EEA beneficiaries were experienced and relatively well-educated workers who find little difficulty in finding competitive employment. On the other hand, public employment programs are not suited to the disadvantaged who need a wide range of services in addition to a job.

It should also be noted that local prime sponsors can continue to provide public service jobs under MRS if they elect to do so. Finally, I should add that the longer a PEP program is continued, the greater the temptation for local governments to build future budgets around federal funds--in effect replacing local funds with federal funds.

Early in the conference, Russell Nixon described the purpose of the gathering as "pouring a group of manpower administrators and experts in a bottle with a group of social workers and educators, shaking it up and seeing what happens." He remarked on the uniqueness of this meeting--manpower and social work people together--and described the need for clearer definitions of functions and skills. The following comments, excerpted from notes and transcripts, address the major questions discussed by the conference.

WHY SHOULD SOCIAL WORKERS BE INVOLVED IN MANPOWER?

Let me identify the strength in social work that I see as a person outside of the social work system...

We found in our studies that caseworkers who had responsibility for employable clients frequently had higher placement rates than the employment services and WIN...They saw their responsibility toward the client. They used whatever community network they knew about to try and find a job...They were not simply matching a person with a job in some paper sense; rather, they were doing a very personalized broker service with an understanding of how the community works...

Most studies show that most people find their jobs on their own, even if they have been to the employment service or are referred from manpower programs...But the manpower programs tend not to know very much about these informal contacts...The informal networks operate almost independently of the formal institutions that we create through legislation and funding programs...

The orientation of the social worker who knows how the community works and how people function in it, who knows about family contacts and has a sense of the social relationships that people are involved in, is a particular contribution that is lacking in the manpower field and must be brought in...

Martin Lowenthal

One of the problems that ran through the speeches... is that when they talked about social work, they only mentioned counseling...

The manpower establishment is heavily ringed around with Praetorian guards who happen to be economists... Some of the institutions in the manpower field are so rigidified, so calcified that what they need is a reawakening...One problem that economists don't touch is that of inter-organizational relationships, of coordinating multiple social service programs and agencies...The economists and the psychologists miss the organizational framework...

One of the strengths in social work is that whether we are organizational specialists or caseworkers, whether we're into community development and planning, our interest in service delivery means an organizational focus...

The organizational framework we have is more challenging than that in the schools of business administration... yet in the 1960's more than 80% of the training programs for manpower experts were in schools of business or public administration or private management consulting firms...

The big problem is trying to convince gate-keepers that the social work curriculum is at least equivalent to anything that the schools of business administration turns out, but that it is different and takes care of different kinds of problems...

Louis Ferman

I'm one of these manpower people that you all try to reach, but I still haven't the slightest idea in the world of what the capabilities of social workers are... Will you please tell me what you have done so beautifully in social work that we should buy?

Janet Pinner

Generic social work skills and human orientation means participation, sensitivity, understanding individual and organizational behavior...

We should be teaching classes to people who work for the employment services so they will understand what social work is. It's not just casework, it's not just group work, it's an understanding of group dynamics, of human needs. And that properly belongs in planning and administration.

Barry Gordon

Certainly, I think that we in the manpower field see the need for the kind of skills we think social workers have...

Many of the programs funded now do not carry the components that will help make people job-ready... Many of the people, before they get to some placement agency, have had other social services...But social workers frequently have no concept of what the job market is like, what labor laws are, and what kind of skills are necessary for a certain job...These are things that social workers should know...

We have not seen the opportunity to join the two disciplines...For the last three years, I have been trying to get social work students into our agency for field work. The reason we have not been able to do that is that we don't have an M.S.W. on staff to supervise them. More openness is necessary, or other views of how social work might cooperate with manpower...

George Carsons

The contribution that social work can make is the human element...

This is a very significant contribution to programs that are fast becoming dehumanized...Social workers can be particularly effective change agents because they come with expertise, feeling and skill that I don't see anyone else involved in the manpower program having right now...Under earlier administrations, programs were confused, but at least they were human.

Social work students should be placed in manpower programs as a mechanism for getting these ideas into these programs...Students who have had experience in

manpower programs should be recruited into schools of social work. I think this double mechanism can effect change much faster than some other measures that I hear going around.

James Chavis

Our Employment Eligibility operation was set up as an income maintenance program, but we are doing more social work than any other section of the Department (of Social Services)...

Social workers should stop thinking about separation of income maintenance and services and think in terms of the whole person again...You can't just hand money out to people, you have to work with them...

In spite of all the manpower training and all the fancy-sounding phrases, in spite of all the studies that have been done with sophisticated mathematical models, the simple truth is that more people are finding jobs on their own because an interested caseworker or community development worker came in contact with them and did something that turned them on to thinking of getting a job...Now that's what social workers have to offer.

Florence Gitten

WHAT KIND OF PREPARATION IS NECESSARY?

In my company, the thing I look for first in staff is somebody who has empathy, concern about human beings and how to work with them...The field of manpower is an art...It calls for the capacity to make personal relationships, which is not gotten out of textbooks and classrooms. You can study social work and you can study manpower, but if you can't relate to people, then you can't do a good job in this field...

Second, I take people who have had personal experience. Our trainers, our manpower specialists frequently are people who themselves have been disadvantaged and have

been brought back into the labor market. We promote from within...It's not enough to place a person; you have to work with him, stay with him, and make sure that the seeds you have planted will take root and grow. Career development is just as important--more important--than the first job. We must establish continuity between the job and the employee..

The third thing I need is somebody who can talk to the private sector. I find that esoteric manpower specialists and esoteric social workers can't talk to employers on a compatible basis. They just don't know how...But if you can show the relationship between manpower as a resource and the resultant industrial payoff in terms of dollars and cents, of having people not drop out of the labor force, of not having to subsidize social services, then I think we will get somewhere...

Samuel Ganz

Unless we deal with what an economist would call the demand side of the labor market and its behavior, unless we teach people about racism in employment, about organizational behavior and organizational reality, and unless we some to understand how these problems get in the way of opportunity, then we engage in a futile exercise...

We operate manpower programs in which we leave the employers virtually free to decide what their staffing patterns will be and how to fulfill them; how they promote and by what criteria; who they will hire; how many they will train; whether they will provide upward mobility; whether they will accept a seniority system for promotion and firing, and so on...

Must we accept these standards that the world of employers, both public and private, hand down--their rules of behavior, their assumed rationality--without challenging them, without scrutinizing them?

Sumner Rosen

Whether you want to work with the manpower system, undermine it, or avoid it, you need to know something about labor markets and labor economics...

Whether you work with clients in manpower programs, in casework, in group work, in community development, what goes on in the labor market is not so simple... You cannot know everything by reading the want-ads...

What manpower people have to bring to others is the concept that out there is a system of many labor markets, or organizational components and responses...If you really understand what you're up against, you can move against that institution to move people into it...

One does have to know about licensing, restrictions on prisoners, credentials, Civil Service requirements, and all the other things that make up the organizational aspects of the labor market...

Marcia Freedman

We must stop training bureaucrats and start training innovative people...

We are all in the manpower field, everybody has something to offer to solve what's been a very tough social problem...It really doesn't matter whether they are economists, of which I am one, or social workers, or the new human relations experts.

What we need is to break out of the mold we've been in and start looking at innovative ideas...

Sheila Akabas

I see a new picture shaping up today...

There is a strong tendency to break down some of the rigid barriers. The people who hire or the people in education are asking much more often, what do you know, what can you do, or what can you learn to do, rather than what profession are you training for and what is your title...

Jean Scaloczi Fine

WHAT JOBS HAVE TO BE DONE?

We find ourselves doing everything in manpower planning, whether it's analysis of the labor market, evaluating programs, or giving technical assistance to one of the categorical manpower programs...

As a manpower planner, with CAMPS, I deal with:

...Labor market conditions in my political jurisdiction
...Demographic information and research methods
...Fiscal management and budgeting
...Legislation pending in Congress
...Political relationships at local, state and national levels
...Program evaluation and monitoring
...Organizational management

Professionally, I'm a social worker...The only other experience I had in manpower was in the Neighborhood Youth Corps Summer Program for three years and a field placement in a vocational rehabilitation program... It was minimal background for what I'm doing now... There are so many different functions in manpower--job development, job counseling, manpower planning...

Oscar Best, Jr.

The social worker involved in planning public employment programs must be concerned with services for clients...

It means that it's not only the job for the client that you're concerned with, but the supporting services as well, such as child care facilities for a welfare mother... It means attention to the "client-flow" system--from the point the client starts at the outside until he gets to the job--so there are the fewest obstacles and frustrations for the client.

Elizabeth Lubetkin

The continuity of service is crucial...

Often there are excellent services, but people get few

benefits because the services are provided in such separate and fragmented ways...We need professionals not only to provide counseling, but also people who know how to negotiate systems, who to go to, how to approach people in corporations, service agencies, planning groups...

Kurt Spitzer

Essentially what's wrong with WIN is that we can't get caseworkers in public welfare and counselors and placement people in the employment service together...

They need to focus on client needs, and develop a comprehensive employability plan, incorporating necessary social services...The successful WIN programs are the ones where the people have gotten together, almost in spite of the system, to do this kind of job. It's really as simple as that.

Charles Odell

The Department of Social Services and the Employment Security Commission (in Michigan) have a mutual stand-off...

In our study of Michigan's WIN program and how the departments coordinate with each other, one of the major findings was that they have virtually no contact with each other...They deprecate each other in terms of ability to function together, to provide an integrated service for the client, and in terms of their own training...

Interestingly enough, they even view the client differently.

Philip Marcus

We found in our studies, with the experimental Short Term Service Modality, that there were four major things that social workers had to do to get welfare mothers ready to go to work...

1. They had to spend inordinate amounts of time on making connections, bringing clients and services together, explaining how arrangements could be made, going to the supermarket, the school.

2. They had to make service delivery concrete and task-oriented. With the clients they listed all the things that had to be done and picked one for a contract. This was an episode of service.

3. When that task was accomplished, a second was picked, either to be done by the client herself or as another episode of service.

4. They had to evaluate, with the client, what happened in each episode of service.

This fits in with the goal-oriented service delivery that the federal government has been talking about...The social worker has to do a great many more things than just 'relate' to the client...

David Franklin

Of 12,000 clients who came to our center, the largest number were middle-aged women with no education, no employment history and no training. Employers don't want them, training sessions don't want them. What do you do with these women?

The young men, 16 to 25, for the most part neither drug addicts nor alcoholics, have chips on their shoulders. What do you do with them?

The young women were more interested in employment, but they have such a terrible image of themselves that we had trouble getting them to look all right to go out into the community for a job. What do you do with them?

The older men, mainly from the south and the islands, are stable but have no education and only farm work experience. What do you do with them?

And the men from 26 to 40 are mainly ex-convicts and alcoholics. They are unattached, their eating habits are poor, they are in poor health. A large number suffer from malnutrition and other serious ailments. They will not go to a doctor willingly. About 65% were unemployable. Of the remaining ones who were considered employable, about 60% had a temporary ailment. What do you do with them?

Alfred Peacock

WHAT SHOULD SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION DO?

We can prepare more people for work in the manpower arena more deliberately than we have done in the past...

It involves discussing placements and ways of working in different settings...whether it is functional in this day and age that all field work supervision must be by M.S.W.'s, whether we need to revise courses to include a field of practice in 'manpower and the world of work'...whether, indeed, we need to prepare specialists for this field of practice the same way we do for practice in family agencies, correctional services and the like...and, whether we need to get input from the world of work into the basic curriculum so that it touches all social work students...

Paul Kurzman

We have to get beyond thinking that when you work outside of the "social worker" title, that you stop doing social work...it's not true and it's not professional.

Myles Johnson

One of the greatest barriers facing us is the expansion of field settings...

Other agencies are very willing to accept our people, but we ourselves have been unable to escape the shackles of what we have locked ourselves into, this M.S.W. game, and actually move out there...

Marvin Feit

Many social workers are manpower specialists...

The question should be how to train social workers to be better manpower specialists, rather than asking what can social workers offer in the abstract. We should concern ourselves with bringing information about manpower activities into the schools of social work...

Susan Pass

Most of us don't have the luxury of a self-contained curriculum in manpower...

We have to compete with other subjects and classification systems...We need to fight for the things we can realistically get into the curriculum if we believe they ought to be there...

Jerome Zimmerman

How far any faculty member can go hinges upon how much freedom there is in curriculum building...

If there are students who are interested in getting into manpower problems, we can work to create field opportunities in manpower agencies...We can offer a program utilizing the resources of social work and other departments...

Gerson David

THE DIMENSIONS OF HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SEMINAR

Herbert S. Parnes
The Ohio State University Department of Economics

In all honesty, I must start by saying that I have virtually no knowledge of the current social work curriculum, nor am I aware of the curriculum issues that must exist among social workers as they do in every other discipline and applied field. If I can make any contribution at all to the undertaking in which we are all engaged, it's got to be to present a view of the scheme and dimensions of manpower; or, if I may use the term, human resources.

What I'd like to do then is present a view of the dimensions of human resources and human resource policy, and let you then establish the connection between that on the one hand, and the concerns of social workers on the other. In addition to that, and as a kind of illustration of it, I then want to refer to an interdisciplinary program in human resource policy that we have developed at Ohio State University.

Russ Nixon observed in his introductory remarks that there is a certain vagueness among manpower people with respect to the dimensions of the field. While I'm sure that's true, I want to state at the outset that there isn't much vagueness in my mind; the vagueness that exists is the result simply of the fact that not everybody who purports to be in the human resource field agrees with the conceptual framework that I have.

I start with the proposition that human resources means simply man in his productive role; and that human resource policy, therefore, relates to all those public and private courses of action that are designed to enhance the effectiveness of man in his productive role.

Herbert S. Parnes is Professor of Economics at the Center for Human Resource Research of The Ohio State University. He directs the National Longitudinal Survey Project sponsored by the Department of Labor.

I'm quite aware of the fact that there are a good many people, and I should be surprised if social work doesn't include many of them, who rather resent the definition of human resources in terms of man in his productive role; that there is a kind of almost moral aversion to viewing man as an instrument, as an agent of production rather than as the end for which all productive activities are designed. So I should like at the outset to emphasize the fact that because I choose to define human resources in this way, by no means should it be taken to signify that I regard the productive role of man as somehow primary. There are many other roles that man plays, such as a spouse or a parent, a member of a community, a citizen of a nation and a member of a world community; and above all else, as thinking and feeling. All of these roles are important. The only thing I do argue is that among the roles of man is his productive role and this role is important both to society and to him. It's important to society because, as Eli Ginzberg has pointed out, the human resources of a nation are the wealth of a nation; and it's important to the individual precisely because the effectiveness with which individuals can perform their other roles depends in large measure on the degree to which they are effective in the productive role. This is simply another way of saying that when you scratch a social work problem, you find a manpower problem.

Well so much then for the concept of human resources. Now, what are the dimensions for human resource policies; that is, what are the respects in which the effectiveness of man in his productive role can be enhanced? What are the processes through which this occurs?

One useful way, certainly not the only way, of categorizing the types of human resource policies is the following:

First there are human resource development policies; that is, the development of human resources. This has several dimensions. The most obvious of them is the creation of vocational skills and knowhow; consequently, the whole educational process is relevant, as are all the training institutions of the society. But human resource development includes more than simply the creation of vocational skills. It includes also the development of what may be called labor market skills; that is, the knowhow of getting along in the labor market, what the dimensions of the world of work are, what the span of job opportunity is,

what the avenues of approach to various occupations are and how one makes oneself attractive to employers. These also include how one goes about looking for a job and, finally, the development of appropriate work attitudes. That's another way of saying the development of a capacity to submit to the regimentation inherent in an industrialized system; a willingness to get up each morning, get going, and so forth. That's what I mean by human resource development.

A second aspect of human resource policy is human resource allocation. By this I mean matching workers and jobs, making certain that the worker whose skills and knowhow and attitude have been developed are distributed most effectively among the available jobs; most effectively both from the standpoint of the needs of the economy and from the standpoint of his own aspirations and tastes. This embraces such activities as vocational guidance and counseling, the activities of the public employment service plus getting people initially into the right jobs, and developing all of those policies that promote desirable kinds of labor mobility while inhibiting useless milling around in the labor market.

The third component of human resource policy is what can be called human resource maintenance, or conservation, which includes two major components. First, the whole area of public health and particularly preventive medicine, and secondly, the whole series of income maintenance programs which from one point of view--the point of view which most of you are accustomed to recognizing--represents a humanitarian motive. But these income maintenance programs may be looked at as another concept: that is, as a means of preserving and conserving valuable productive capacity during the period in which individuals for one reason or another are unable to otherwise utilize them.

A fourth aspect of human resource policy is one that, depending upon how broadly one wishes to define it, could embrace everything I talked about so far: human resource utilization. In the rather more restricted definition that I'm reserving for this term, it means all of those policies that are designed to avoid waste in the use of available human resources. It entails the stamping out of all kinds of discrimination, for example; because discrimination upon an age basis, upon a sex basis, upon a color basis, upon religion basis, indeed on every criteria unrelated to functional performance, is not only

a moral outrage but a kind of criminal waste. Human resource utilization itself embraces in the private sector the whole realm of personnel and industrial relations policies on the supposition that the effectiveness of the human being in the productive process is not unaffected by that complex of policies.

Finally, although I don't think it is a human resource policy, I'd like to mention something which is really from some points of view more important than anything that I have mentioned; that is, the general economic policy of maintaining a high level of demand. Unless there is a high level of demand for goods and services and therefore for labor, it doesn't make sense to worry about productive input.

My purpose in having gone through that list is to try to deduce from it what human resource specialists ought to know. The first thing that emerges from that conceptual framework is that perhaps it makes more sense not to think of a human resource specialist, but rather of groups of human resource specialists. Broad concepts may indeed be needed for the kind of individual who has a very grand and fairly good perception of the whole sphere; the kind of person that Fred Harbison of Princeton has called the human resource strategist. But in a world of specialization, the fact is that most of us have more narrowed specialties. In this concept of human resource and human resource policy, there are a large number of occupational specialties that are relevant. The teacher is a human resource specialist, the trainer is a human resource specialist, the administrator of training programs is a human resource specialist, the director of an employment service is a human resource specialist. Going even further, the educational planner is a human resource specialist as is the health planner, the labor market analyst, the personnel director. The industrial relations director and the union negotiator are also human resource specialists.

I am now tempted to add the social worker as a human resource specialist, not because the social worker is or indeed should be primarily interested in man in his productive role, but rather because the social worker's concern for the total welfare of the individual cannot ignore the degree to which he functions effectively in that productive role.

The recognition that there is a series of human resource specialists leads me next to the proposition that there is no single curriculum for the human resource specialist. That I accept as an article of faith rather than anything else. It seems to me so terribly logical that I don't really understand how anybody can differ with it. Each of these specialists that I have mentioned, and perhaps some others I haven't thought of, can perform this specialty more effectively if he understands how it fits into the framework that I have described.

I think that one of the sources of the human resource problems that we face is precisely the fact that educators and trainers haven't understood enough about the world of work, they haven't been sufficiently mindful of the world of work. By the same token, I know from my own experience that manpower specialists and planners are limited by the fact that they know too little about what goes on in the educational system and are too uncertain in their own minds as to what could go on in the educational system. Each of these specialties can profit from an understanding of its connection with each of them, and of the way it fits into the grand scheme of things.

That has lead us at Ohio State University to work for the development of an interdisciplinary curriculum in human resource policy.

One aspect of the curriculum is an interdisciplinary seminar which is designed to do precisely what I have just described, namely, to bring together individuals who are preparing themselves for a specialty in one or another aspect of this total human resource area. This is done so as to allow each of them to understand the dimension of the whole area, and to allow all of them to profit from each other's individual contributions.

This seminar is under the guidance of an interdisciplinary faculty committee that includes two members of the Economics Department whose specialty is labor economics, members of the faculty from Preventive Medicine, Education Development, the Department of Psychology, the Department of Sociology, the School of Public Administration, and the Department of Political Science. We don't have a School of Social Work represented, but we do have a social work student in the seminar, and we have had social work faculty representation on an informal

basis. We have run this seminar three times with the number of students ranging between 17 and 25, so we have a faculty-student ratio that is probably higher than anything in the University. The students come from all the fields represented by the faculty plus social work, agriculture, commerce, and rural sociology because we embrace the human resource problems not only of the contemporary United States, but also of developing economies throughout the world.

We start with a conceptual framework which I generally present and which is generally an even more long-winded elaboration of the one that I began with here.

Then in the second week we talk about the economic concept of investment in human capital, drawing in a simplified and non-technical way on the work of such people as Gary Becker and Theodore Schultz, etc., developing the notion that human resource development is a process of capital formation, which from a standpoint of its wealth-producing capabilities is completely analogous to the process of physical capital accumulation, that is, the building of factories and productive machinery, etc.

In the third week, we spend time on population policies, talking about demographies in general. Here is one of the areas in which the sociologists make their contribution to the seminar.

In the fourth week, we talk about employment policies, dealing with matters that are reserved for the very end of the presentation that I made; in other words, general economic policies designed to promote high levels of demand for labor in the economy.

In the fifth week, we deal with educational policies for human resource development, looking at formal educational systems.

On the sixth week, we have human resource development outside the formal educational system itself. At the most recent seminar we invited in Gerry Somers from the University of Wisconsin to talk about the whole of training situations outside the formal educational system in the United States.

In the seventh week, we talk about health care policies. This was the realm of the Preventive Medicine members of the faculty.

In the eighth week we brought in a delightful economist, Leonard Hausman from the Heller School of Brandeis, to talk on income maintenance policies.

In the ninth week we deal with sufficiency and equity of labor market operations, which is a jazzy way of talking about the way in which the labor market tends to operate in the absence of conscious intervention, and the respects in which the normal operations of the labor market can be relied upon to produce equitable and sufficient results. Now this, of course, is one way of asking what kind of labor market policies are required in order to overcome the inadequacies of a free labor market.

In the tenth week, we look at one aspect of human resource utilization: the quality of work experience, the whole area of job enrichment. In the most recent offering of this seminar, we brought in Jack Barbash from the University of Wisconsin to deal with that topic.

The second quarter of the seminar is devoted to an examination of techniques of human resource planning, directed largely at the concerns of the educational planner, the manpower planner, and health planner, etc.

The third quarter of the sequence, which we are now involved in, is a practicum in which we develop practical research projects that are related to the students' own interests. For instance, at the moment my colleague Chris Kelly and I are working with three students, two of whom are social workers, on the following question: the Governor of Ohio has taken the position that "You just give me enough money and I'll show you how manpower programs ought to operate. What we'll do is develop employment opportunities in the public sector for disadvantaged individuals, particularly those on welfare." What we are doing with the student group is a practical piece of research looking at the extent this strategy can be relied upon: in the short term, the characteristics of job opportunities in the public sector, and in the longer term, the kinds of job opportunities that can be generated in the public sector; on the supply side, the proportion of the welfare population that can be expected to be absorbed in this kind of a scheme. I mention this because it illustrates one very practical aspect of cooperation between manpower specialists on the one hand,

and social workers on the other.

I don't think that a one-quarter seminar such as I described is enough for the purpose you're talking about. For instance, one of the two social workers who are involved in this seminar has taken the labor market course that I offer in the Department of Economics. Over the period in which we offered the seminar there have been three social workers who have taken that labor market course. In that course we do indeed talk about the kinds of labor market changes and problems that you're involved with; the difficulty is that it's impossible in a one-quarter interdisciplinary seminar. But I guess if I could be presumptuous enough to recommend what I would regard to be the minimum input into a social work curriculum it would be at a minimum, a semester or a quarter in labor economics, provided it is the right kind of course in labor economics, which incidentally is increasingly difficult to find these days and particularly in an economics department. That, plus some kind of integrated seminar of the kind that I have described would be the minimum.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT FOR PROFESSIONALS: A SPECIALIZED MASTERS DEGREE PROGRAM

Henry Cohen
New School for Social Research

When one is addressing curriculum problems from the vantage point of a professional school as distinct from an interdisciplinary seminar program such as Mr. Parnes described, one must struggle with the mix in the curriculum between the theoretical and the practical. So I would reduce the problems to three elements for consideration.

First are the textural problems, second are the knowledge problems, and third are the technique issues: the three main components of the instruction situation.

As for the value questions that have been raised, frankly I think that if the social work community is going to get into the issues of manpower, it will be doing itself a disservice if it starts with an adversary point of view. The way in which we deal in our program with the value question is twofold: we have instructors with almost every conceivable point of view and we have a broad mix of students.

I remember the first faculty meeting last September, when all of these different people from the world of work and elsewhere were getting together and becoming caught up as a faculty. They started saying that in order to be of help to the students, each one should be relatively neutral, not telling his point of view. I said to them, "No, I'm getting

---

Henry Cohen is the Dean of the Center for New York City Affairs at the New School for Social Research. He was Deputy City Administrator in Mayor Robert F. Wagner's Administration and First Deputy Administrator in the Human Resources Administration for John Lindsay. He helped to develop the original manpower programs in 1960 and recently created the specialized M.A. degree at the New School in Human Resources and Manpower Development.

you in because of your point of view. That will enrich the point of view of the student as well as of the program." In effect, it seems to me what the students have to be engaged in as part of the teaching process must be the result of every point of view including points of view as seen from the business community, or the different business communities; there is no unified point of view.

The way one deals with the value question is not by a party line in the school of social work, not an adversary position, but rather by a curriculum which brings in different points of view.

The second way in which we deal with curriculum problems--mixing our students--would be a little harder for the school of social work. We have students from different disciplines, from all agencies, from private business and voluntary agencies. In each class people are being exposed to different perceptions of the world of work.

It's been fascinating to me, as one of the inventors of the concept of the manpower system, what a narrow conception of the manpower system we have had. There is an enrichment process that takes place with regard to the broader manpower system and the human resource system when you have a mix of students and a mix of point of view.

However, in writing a curriculum, don't expect much help from the practitioners. You cannot expect them to give you more than clue words to what they need in a person; nor can you expect even to receive the clue words systematically or comprehensively; nor can you expect them to be consistently imaginative enough to define something that they <u>might</u> use if they <u>had</u> it, but aren't aware of how useful it could be. You have to get beyond the fact that practitioners aren't defining skills they need.

Avoid the tendency to devote yourselves to the barriers and hangups so that nothing happens for a year. Your strategy has to be how to avoid the limits of the field, the limits in your own profession--all of the philosophical dilemmas that are really hangup issues. Don't depend on the practitioners; don't depend on your students for the answers. Keep moving. Defy the ordinary laws of gravity with regard

to program development.

Another thing we discovered as we were getting clue words from all over the world about what was needed in a manpower curriculum, was that there was so much to be incorporated that it couldn't be done in two years. We decided to break up our semester into two parts.

Initially we offered all the courses on a seven week basis; imagine compressing a course on "Sociology of Work" into seven weeks! Well, Parnes compresses it into one evening, so I guess seven weeks isn't all that bad; but can you imagine compressing a course in "Planning and Methods" into seven weeks?

We discovered in the course of the first semester that in some areas the compression was just impossible. The faculty and students complained that before they gained altitude they were already having to reach the landing point. So, with a sensitive ear to the faculty and students, I decided what were the subjects that most needed stretching out to fourteen weeks. As a result, some courses are seven and some are fourteen weeks.

But if manpower content is to be offered within the framework of other professional programs, one of the things to explore is how it can be integrated into other courses in the curriculum. They don't all have to be manpower courses. If there is a course in "Social Planning" or "Methods of Social Planning," build some manpower content into that course. You don't need a separate manpower course for every field.

Now let me enumerate some of the courses that we are offering; I'll just read for the moment from our first year's outline because I'm still working on the second year. Certain things that I can assume would be covered anyway in a social work curriculum, for example a course "Economic Politics and the Sociology of Poverty," I have to offer as an individual course in this program.

Our course "Sociology of Work" will have a different emphasis depending upon the instructor. It could deal with work in the history of man, approaches to work in different cultures, a cross-cultural view of work with different theories of work: the Marxian view of capitalism and labor, the capitalist view,

the work ethic, the Protestant view, and with more current issues in terms of quality of the work experience, work satisfaction, leisure time and the whole set of work issues.

Incidentally, it would seem to me that that kind of course would be a good one for all social workers, even if they aren't going into the manpower field.

Next we have a number of courses to deal with labor economics, labor markets, the structure and dynamics of urban manpower and manpower economics, and we're going to have an introductory course in economics because we find our people can't effectively understand some of the terms used in the labor market courses without some basic background. This is a course that most social work students could take elsewhere in the university.

Then we have a basic introductory course in the field of manpower as a required course for all students. We offer one course in "Learning Theory and Problems of Special Groups" and another one on "Process in Career Development," that's the new language for the counselor. We have another basic course on "Training and Overview" and we are going to offer more courses in the training field. We have a full semester's required course on "Quantitative Methods of Manpower Research."

A seven week course on "Managing a Manpower Program" covers the elements in managing staff problems, budgeting problems, organizational problems, and service delivery problems. We are offering a fourteen week course in program design that is both conceptual and methodological in character.

Then, partly because we think people in the private sector need exposure to the perspectives of the public sector, we are offering a course in "Public-Private Sector Relationships." Two powerhouse instructors are doing it jointly: the State Industrial Commissioner and the Vice-President of a major securities house downtown, handling it sort of as adversaries. Other courses in managing large scale organizations deal with the nature of organizations and some human relations personnel issues.

In the second year there will be some very practical courses such as a seven weeker in "Program Writing." Again, to the extent that social work programs deal with proposal development, there would be no need to set up a separate course for manpower students.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL WELFARE: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM

Dennis Derryck
Brandeis University
Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare

The manpower program at the Heller School was designed to relate to the other programs that exist within the rest of the University, and to take into consideration what exists at the other universities in the area.

Since schools are limited by the resources of their own faculties, the Center was established as a separate program, but it has only one full-time staff member. How do we handle this? We have a program where all our modular courses are taught by people from other universities--Harvard, Tufts, Boston University, Boston College, Northeastern University.

In trying to develop a full curriculum in the manpower area, and in looking at the problems of generic and specific knowledge, we discovered that it is specific areas where we can't find courses. Therefore, we use modular courses that run from two to eight weeks and develop them around a given area.

In particular areas, we pick up other courses to get the skills and techniques that have been developed in order to

---

Dennis Derryck is Director of the Center for Manpower Administration and Development at the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University, a program underwritten by an institutional grant of the Department of Labor. He helped to develop and was Research Director of the Joint Apprenticeship Program, a program co-sponsored by the A. Philip Randolph Institute and Workers Defense League, which concentrates on opening up minority job opportunities in the construction industry through the apprenticeship system.

bring them into the manpower area. For instance, we have a course on manpower planning that ran four sessions. We thought that, through the regular planning sequence, the students would have already gotten basic skills and then, in these four sessions, they would be able to integrate manpower content into the conceptual framework they learned earlier.

This is a Ph.D. program. We start off initially with a set of core courses in four priority areas: one in "Urban Education and Manpower Policies"; a second dealing with the "Sociological and Psychological Aspects of Work; two courses on "Urban Economics and the Economics of the Labor Market"; and a very special course on the "Manpower Problems of the Disadvantaged."

It doesn't end there. There is a required course on "Income Maintenance." There is a research sequence in which we have such courses as "Operational Research and Complex Variables," the course in "Multi-Varied Analysis" is a requirement of all our Ph.D. students in the manpower area.

We get a mix of views by opening up all our modular courses to staff from state manpower offices, from regional federal offices, and the CAMPS directors. Students within the manpower program therefore get a range of views from these various agencies in a number of courses.

The program is heavily research-oriented and it focuses on structural problems and how they affect the employment of the disadvantaged. We relate a great deal, for example, to the gerontology program and doctoral research on the employment problems of workers over 45--the gerontological implications, whether or not their training should be specialized, where their placement should be in light of their coming retirement. We are also developing a course on the "Administration of Public Programs" at the Harvard Business School, the Kennedy Institute, and the Heller School. We are all working out the type of courses that should be taught jointly, at Brandeis, or rotated among the three schools.

In studying the primary labor markets, we have been concerned about the situational and institutional components that affect individuals, and have come up with two sets of structural factors.

The first includes the factors that are intrinsic to the job, such things as customs and traditions, factors involved with discrimination, on-the-job problems in each particular industry.

A second set of factors are called exponalities, such as the role of the federal government in intervening with Equal Employment Opportunities. Strangely enough, we find ourselves classifying almost all of the supportive services, when relating to the primary markets, as being exponalities.

We are just finishing one study showing that, despite counseling assistance and negotiation before arriving at a particular job, the primary labor market still presents an entrant with obstacles. For example, discrimination and on-the-job problems are so inter-related that we find there are almost no supporting services that, in a traditional sense, can be given to individuals once they enter the primary labor market situation.

We have also just completed one study on the apprenticeship system used in the construction industry, the most primary job you can get, and despite average wage rates of roughly $4.75 per hour, we all know that there are high drop-out rates for the minorities, and in general for the whole system.

So we find ourselves with a dilemma. How do we act as agents in adjusting to these things of custom and tradition? Once you teach an individual to negotiate a system, pass an exam, there is very little, in the traditional sense, that can be done to assist them.

The problem is a critical one for us as educators and because it affects our decisions about where we fit in as change agents in the primary labor market.

INDUSTRIAL SOCIAL WELFARE:
TRAINING SOCIAL WORKERS FOR THE WORLD OF WORK

Hyman J. Weiner
Columbia University School of Social Work

A conceptual scheme is not going to be very helpful to bridge the gap between the world of work and the world of social work. For years they have passed each other like ships in the night. The issue is how to develop a linkage--and linkages come from program development.

If schools of social work want to get close to the world of work, they've got to pay attention to services to people at least at two ends of the traffic--the point where people come tumbling out of the labor force, and the point where they have to get back via the rehabilitation route.

At the Industrial Social Welfare Center, we address ourselves to three types of social worker. The primary type is working in the world of work. The second would be in a mental hospital or social agency, trying to help a discharged patient get back to the world of work. The third type is the manpower social worker.

We see the social worker in relation to the world of work as a coordinator or mediator between the client and the work world. We conceptualize that the client does not know what he has to do to make it and survive. Even though he may have been in the work world a long time, he needs a reassessment. The world of work does not know how to incorporate or integrate him.

We do a very narrow, conservative, not comprehensive, assessment of work problems. We ask only whether his problems interfere with the world of work and staying there.

Hyman J. Weiner is Associate Professor of Social Group Work at the Columbia University School of Social Work where he directs the Industrial Social Welfare Center, a program he founded and originally developed with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union.

The social worker has to learn to operate in several worlds--between the client and the work world, between the client and his family, and between the client and social, health, and welfare assistance systems. The social worker serves in a coordinating capacity. He performs a variety of tasks:

* The social worker has to locate customers. For example, when you go into a labor union, you must meet with everyone, from shop stewards through management. A case-finding technology and a case-finding network gets developed.

* The social worker needs to know what symptoms, what work habits are not making it in the world of work.

* The social worker has to provide counseling and employ-ability planning.

  Sometimes this includes counseling against those systems that interfere. For example, the worker finds that the first day on the job he does not like to be talked to by the foreman. We work at that--how he responds to the foreman, what did he do, does he really want that job, how he has to hold back some of those impulses. This is a question of impulse control.

  Sometimes counseling includes family work. There are clients who really cannot respond to any kind of counseling because they are locked into relationships with the family. Learning how to identify conditions under which you reach out to family members is important.

* The social worker does job development when he makes an employer who has hired one client hospitable to another.

* The social worker follows-up. He keeps on-going records of the client and his work world. Each social workers does his own assessment and, after thirty days, gets the client's.

* The social worker works with the work organization--the shop steward, the foreman, the manager. He provides consultation when the client and his boss are at odds.

* And finally, the social worker handles the client's health and welfare problems with the employer or labor union and intervenes with health and welfare agencies. He wins the right to call the agency on behalf of the union. He puts some responsibility on the world of work, so they can work hand in hand.

Training is involved and consultation is involved. If we don't get through to the managers and the unions, then we do not make it in the world of work.

* The social worker, therefore, has to sit down and learn the industry, and that is where the people in the world of work educate the social worker.

We base our social work training on the available curriculum, but we have developed a special course called "Social Service in the World of Work." The program started originally with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union and is now based at the Columbia University School of Social Work. We have nine social work students placed in various positions in the world of work, some working for a union lobby, some for a department store union. Our main purpose at the Industrial Center is not just to get people into the world of work, but to keep them there.

WHAT EVERY SOCIAL WORKER SHOULD KNOW: GENERIC MANPOWER COMPONENTS FOR THE SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM

Edward E. Schwartz
Washington University
George Warren Brown School of Social Work

Our task was to indicate what every young social worker should know about work and employment, in other words, what should be the general components in the curriculum of schools of social work.

We took the graduate school of social work as a point of departure and discussed modifications to the curricula of the standard graduate school curriculum.

A fact of life that we recognized was that manpower services--or the world of work, however you want to term it--is probably only the latest in a whole series of specializations that social work education has recognized. The social work curriculum is already considered by most social work educators to be rather overcrowded, so it is not possible to add to any existing curriculum large segments of additional content. Rather we would introduce concepts relating to the world of work and employment as unobtrusively as possible, but emphatically.

We considered our task within a kind of a latin square design. Taking four quadrants, the access or horizontal quadrant can be divided into macrosystems and microsystems. In the vertical

---

Edward E. Schwartz is a Professor of Social Welfare Administration at the George Warren Brown School of Social Work. He earlier spent a good part of his teaching career at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration where he was George Herbert Jones Professor in Public Administration and Social Welfare Policy. He has had a continuing interest in curriculum development. This is the report of the conference workshop which considered generic curriculum components.

axis, we have the well-known false dichotomy of knowledge and skill. We've left out attitudes. But the first quadrant, knowledge of the microsystems, relates to knowledge of individual behavior, human growth and development, and particularly the impact of the social environment on such growth and behavior. We developed, perhaps, three major categories of content, not as courses, but as emphases.

The first would be the meaning of work to the individual; the second would be universal problems of workers; and the third would be problems of handicapped workers.

The meaning of work we understand to be the meaning of work to the individual in our culture, but with some recognition of the fact that there are different possible meanings of work. We are particularly concerned with making the distinction between work as an expressive activity of human action, employment representing a status, and work within a particular framework.

We think that consideration would be given a variety of lifestyles and ways of gaining access to needed material resources through the extended family, barter systems, cooperatives, communes, even possibly an industrial mode.

We would consider an industrial mode of work or employment in terms of both its cost and benefit; the problem of socialization of the individual to industrial employment; the place of work in the life of modern persons. So much for the philosophical concept of work and employment.

Then we would consider with the students what might be called universal problems of workers:

* the transition from one position to another and the crises which accompany such transitional ventures, for example, movement from school to employment and changes of employment, including upward mobility;

* separation from employment, unemployment and periods of unemployment;

* the transition from employment to nonemployment sometimes humorously known as retirement.

Then we would consider the question of special problems confronting handicapped workers, marginal workers--the underclass. We would consider such individuals in terms of the geneology of their status and the results.

Viewing this group broadly, we would consider workers who are handicapped for physical reasons, mental reasons, emotional and social reasons. This would include drug addicts and alcoholics; persons stigmatized by institutionalization in prison, mental hospitals and the like; the socially handicapped, including minority groups and particularly the poor, whether they are poor by a lack of education, large families or what have you.

Then we would consider the special problems of the unemployed, the underemployed and underpayment.

Now for our second quadrant, which would be methods and skills to be employed in microsystems. This means, in traditional social work education terms, chiefly casework and group work.

Our first tenet would be a balancing out of materials both in the classroom and in the practicum. This means for courses, the development and selection of case material in which problems of work and employment are central--or at least significant.

It would mean, with respect to the practicum, a number of options. One would be placement in specialized employment and other manpower service settings. Another would be placement in a more traditional or possibly generalized setting, with stimulation of interest and focus on problems of work and employment. A third, particularly for younger and less experienced students, would be the use of placement as work experience. An effort would be made to help a student become conscious of the problems of work in the large bureaucracies, the problems of receiving and delivering authority, authoritative transactions, and in general, the nature of organizational processes, including recognition of the problems of managers and the care and feeding of your boss.

The second major emphasis would have students balancing out treatment perspectives; including more emphasis on such modalities as advocacy, necessary confrontation, or other

ways of working through employment problems with employers in favor of employees; also the use of what is called the industrial welfare system, exploiting resources available internally in the work situation, not only fringe benefits and other cash benefits, but also possible services.

Then, moving from the work situation itself to the larger community, we would explore the use of community human resources not only in the traditional way of referring people to health services, educational services, and the like, but through interprofessional forms of work organization, including interdisciplinary teams and other methods involving transactions with other professional people.

We would further need to see work through client perceptions, and to study motivation in the employment situation; that is, diagnosis and treatment.

Parenthetically, it occurred to me as I was working late last night over this material, that possibly the reason that case material and the general emphasis in traditional casework has not been heavily in the work place is because Freud's patients were chiefly middle-class Viennese women. We think we have emancipated ourselves from Freud, but perhaps we can now move into new areas of concern or at least share our areas of concern between the boudoir and the work place.

The third quadrant that we'll consider is knowledge of macrosystems and what we commonly think of as the traditional type of curriculum in social policy, but broadly conceived. The major emphasis here is to move out from the traditional view of the history and development of social welfare to the work-welfare nexus.

As one example, the poor laws ordinarily are considered a landmark in social welfare legislation but they can also be viewed as chiefly a matter of labor legislation.

Secondly, we would deal with the manpower process and structure in the United States and the structure of the labor market, including enough demographic considerations to at least familiarize students with the sources of data and the terminology. The study of the labor market as we call it here, is an old fashioned study of labor economics.

Thirdly, we would consider problems and frictions in the labor market, with particular emphasis on governmental intervention to eliminate such problems. This would include description and analysis of manpower programs and services, and of human resources program services that impinge particularly on work and employment.

Finally, possibly, we would venture into some pertinent problems of macro-economics, particularly the reciprocal relationship of unemployment and inflation.

Quadrant four turns to macro-methods, methods to be used in operating a large social system. We would consider that, again, in traditional terminology. This would represent an application of skills in administration, community organization and planning to the neophyte social worker's view of the world of work and poverty.

TRAINING MANPOWER PROFESSIONALS IN SOCIAL WORK: A CURRICULUM FOR SPECIALISTS

Harry Specht
University of California School of Social Welfare

For identifying what kind of knowledge must be included in training administrators, program developers and planners to work in the field of manpower, we separated out generic knowledge--the kind of things people would get in core courses; specific knowledge--the sort of things requiring specialized courses; and experiential knowledge--the sort of thing students would get in field work.

If we wanted to organize an entire MSW program to prepare people for a career in manpower, the curriculum plan would start with broad conceptual analyses of problems and the development of a systems view of the world of work and manpower, around which both course and field experiences would be organized. It would include training, problem definition analysis, statistical mappings, manpower problems, manpower opportunities, causes, theories about problems of manpower, both from a structural and an interpersonal point of view, analysis of current programs and policies, training and proposal writing for manpower programs, manpower planning, program administration and manpower programming, program evaluation in manpower and so forth.

Most schools simply don't have the resources to set up that kind of a self-contained unit for individual problem areas. In addition, the problem focus as a way of organizing curriculum might be both too broad in some respects and too narrow in others: too broad in the sense that it attempts

---

Harry Specht is Professor and Chairman of the Community Organization sequence at the University of California School of Social Welfare in Berkeley. He has written extensively about community organization and social work issues. This is the report of the conference workshop which dealt with curriculum needs for students majoring in program planning and administration.

to prepare students to deal with everything in an institutional area, and too narrow in the sense that if you are training students for a career in social work you are often dealing with young people who don't know about the institutions of social welfare and its various modes of intervention. Focusing on one problem area may narrow the perspective of the students too early.

Returning to the identification of generic, specific and experiential knowledge, I would point out that social work education is always struggling with this matter, as are all professions at different times.

In social work I think much of the debating that goes on, for example, around ethnic content in the curriculum, is often an issue of the generic versus the specific. Do you in community organization focus on how students will work with the black community or the Puerto Rican community specifically, or do you deal with the more generic problem of how to gain entree to groups generally?

There is material in all of the introductory courses to the various areas of social work training that provides students with the kind of general knowledge they would need to work in the manpower area, as well as any other. That is, students require the underpinning of social science concepts that apply across the board in many institutions.

For example, one of the items of importance to manpower specialists here was the notion that you have to develop a good deal of skill in group management, in being able to work with different kinds of personnel as well as community groups. That we tend to view as a kind of knowledge and skill that is generic and would be found in most MSW programs which prepare a student for administration, planning and program evaluation. We would tend to view as generic skills, for example, dealing with legislators and local officials, legal procedures, how to use information systems, program planning, proposal writing, analysis of communities, organizations' influence patterns and power systems.

Now on the experiential end what students would get in field work and various other kinds of experiences where they apply

ideas, would be such things as learning the names of different programs, understanding the traditional functions of staff within the manpower system, learning the specific rules and routines that operate, becoming familiar with what Murray Frank called the fraternity, the club that exists within the manpower field.

An incidental problem that was raised in regard to experiential learning was that many social work schools are reluctant to use people as field instructors who don't have MSWs. This creates a barrier to getting students into manpower institutions. The workshop did not view this as a problem in the sense that the essential question involves the educational experience: what are the students getting and whether the person who provides the instruction has the capacity to give it, that the MSW was not an essential requirement.

On the issue of specific knowledge, we're not very clear on whether this material should be given in special courses on manpower or might appear in core courses as they were described by Ed Schwartz.

For example, some things I will mention could be part of an introductory course on human growth and development, in another course given elsewhere in the university. The following, in no order of priority, are major items identified as the important, specific kinds of knowledge that students would need to be administrators or planners in the field of manpower.

First, some preparation in sociology, the psychology of work and the world of work. Second, the study of urban economics, economics of the labor market. Third, the development of an ability to deal with data on local labor markets and some knowledge of the sources of data on the local labor markets. Fourth, the impact of public policy on the labor market and the impact of manpower policy on what Herbert Parnes referred to as economic policy to maintain a high level of demand or stabilization. Fifth, the institutional arrangement that pertains to manpower agencies and organizations. Sixth, methods of analyzing and assigning delivery systems for manpower programs. Seventh, job development skills; such things as understanding how to talk to people, industry, how to deal with jobs-creation issues. Eighth, career mobility planning, staff development. Ninth, an understanding of the language and the factors involved in packaging programs

in the manpower arena. Tenth, a collection of items such as unionism--both public and industrial--industrial relations, licensing, dealing with merit systems and civil service.

TRAINING SOCIAL WORKERS: A MANPOWER CONCENTRATION IN SOCIAL WORK

Valerie Jorrin
Columbia University School of Social Work

Our program at Columbia University, the Laboratory for Community Programming, has been concerned with the development of a field work program in manpower for social work students in community organization and planning. It has three main components:

First, the students are assigned to work in various program agencies with people in responsible positions who arrange and supervise their work in the agency. Selection of the agencies, negotiations regarding program assignments and supervisors, matching students and agencies, and dealing with any problems over the year are all the responsibility of the Laboratory staff. In the terminology of the School of Social Work, students are "placed" with the Laboratory, which then carries out and completes the field assignment process.

Second, field instruction is provided by the staff of the Laboratory, trained social workers experienced in community organization and planning, who are based at the School of Social Work. Social work orientation and skill is developed in an integrating program carried out by the Laboratory staff. It includes individual field instruction, weekly seminars which encompass special presentations by the students,

---

Valerie Jorrin, Project Director of the Laboratory for Community Programming, has long been involved with field work programs in community organization and planning. While with New York City's Housing and Development Administration, she developed paraprofessional and on-the-job training in the building trades for residents of poor neighborhoods as director of the emergency housing repair program. The program of the Laboratory for Community Programming is described in detail in a companion report to this volume.

readings, and guest lecturers, and collaborative student efforts on term papers or other projects assigned in the classroom. The subjects of the seminars, papers and projects are all based in the field experience, but go far beyond discussion of daily activities. They provide opportunities for advanced work by the students individually and in groups. In analyzing major programmatic and political issues, the students are able to compare different perspectives in depth--in this case, the views of the manpower agencies with views generated by a social work orientation.

Third, all students placed with the Laboratory are required to take the course taught by Russell Nixon, "Manpower, the Labor Market, and Social Policy." Although this is only a one-semester course, it provides a basic introduction to manpower programs, policies, issues and data sources.

We have found that a field work program (as contrasted with a discrete assignment for one student) which includes a variety of assignments undertaken by different student participants, group seminars and projects, and school-based field instruction, in combination with at least one course such as the one taught by Professor Nixon, does provide meaningful training in the manpower field within the social work curriculum.

In each of our three years, the field assignments and over-all activity of the Laboratory was different. This was a deliberate exploration of various options. We think that this third year was definitive in terms of the agencies where the students worked, and the quality and extent of the manpower-social work relationships in which the students participated and from which they learned about the manpower field, about social work, and about their own skills.

This year our approach was to develop manpower assignments in government agencies at the city, state and federal levels that were dealing with aspects of related programs. These assignments were in addition to several in our community technical assistance program in day care that we had established the year before.

Because of the current interest in "workfare" and other ways of connecting welfare recipients with work programs, we looked for assignments that would deal with these efforts, a particularly critical development for those concerned with social welfare.

This is the way it worked out:

One student was with the State Employment Service where she carried out a research project comparing WIN participants who were working and off welfare, and WIN participants who were working and still receiving welfare.

A second student was with the planning unit of the Emergency Employment Program of New York City. She worked on the last-phase efforts to move people from public service employment into unsubsidized jobs.

A third student was a member of the planning and evaluation unit of the New York City Department of Employment. He did an evaluation of institutional training vendors, participated in a task force study of macro-economic factors in the New York City labor market in preparation for revenue sharing, and helped develop evaluation instruments for the WREP program. (This is the attempt to move public assistance funds into job creation which was described by Commissioner Rose.)

A fourth student was involved with labor market analysis and program evaluation at the Manpower Area Planning Council, the New York City CAMPS. He worked primarily on various aspects of the WIN program.

The fifth student in manpower was a member of the WIN task force in the Regional Manpower Administrator's Office. He was involved in monitoring how the WIN program is being carried out in New York and New Jersey.

These students learned about the varied implementation of manpower programs, about their relationship to welfare programs, about enabling legislation and the implications of alternate policies. They were particularly interested in the Talmadge

Amendment, just being implemented, and so six or seven weeks of the seminar was devoted to a detailed analysis of the legislation and how it was being implemented. Each student took part in preparing and gathering relevant material for distribution to the group, in presenting and analyzing the ways his agency or program was involved, and in discussing how certain aspects could help or hurt clients. Everyone, including the staff, learned a lot.

The kinds of skills learned were analytic, programmatic and political. Program development, analysis and evaluation were part of every assignment in some way. Exposure to legislation and its broader politics was also basic, as well as the more mundane daily politics of each institution. Additionally, through the Laboratory, the students had their own manpower-welfare-day care network. They were able to help each other in their field assignments and in their class work as a result of the inter-relationships of the assignments and their involvement in a program whose scope was broader than any possible in a single assignment.

None of the students were involved in any direct service, but since all of them had already had experience they had a sense of what happens to people involved in these programs--and they were sensitive to the distance between client and program planner. It would seem that people working in the manpower field as planners and administrators should have some basic knowledge and experience at the client level.

Having had the actual experience of working with clients made our student social workers almost unique in these programs where their colleagues were economists, econometrists, planners, political scientists and other assorted manpower professionals. It was apparent that client needs as a frame of reference was a distinct contribution.

THOUGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

Jule M. Sugarman
New York City Human Resources Administration

Thinking out where you are going in a long-term trend, you have to look very carefully at the nature of manpower problems in the years ahead. I suspect that the past is not going to be pertinent in a very precise way since the nature of the United States' manpower problem will change in some identifiable and other unidentifiable ways.

One identifiable change will be that the manpower pool, the number of people of working age, is certainly going to show sharp fluctuations because of the changing birthrate both upward and downward. That implies that there is going to be more or less employment. There are likely to be periods of severe shortage of manpower in this country, as well as periods of severe over-supply.

Secondly, the kind of people who are a part of the manpower pool are likely to change significantly. One trend which is clearly identifiable is the involvement of more and more women in the manpower pool, women of all ages, women with and without children.

My own belief is that you will see a much heavier involvement of young people in some form of manpower pool because I expect that the essential educational reform of the next decade will place more and more high school students in work situations of some type. I frankly don't believe there is enough content to fill up those twelve years nor is there enough interest on the part of the students to stay twelve years in school.

Jule M. Sugarman, Commissioner of the Department of Social Services and Administrator of the Human Resources Administration, oversees all of New York City's programs in social welfare, manpower, youth, children, and community action. He was one of the originators of Project Head Start and served as Acting Director of the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Developing more alternatives to classroom education is going to have a manpower impact. We now have schools without walls where students concentrate heavily on experience, as distinguished from formal classroom instruction. The Human Resources Administration operates an Executive Intern Program for 800 students working as special assistants to senior executives in the public and voluntary field, without pay, but with a manpower development concept.

The cooperative educational program in the city has been long established and I think will grow substantially, so I see a whole body of new people being added to the manpower pool and creating, of course, other kinds of problems.

I think there will be much more continuity in education; by that, I mean people leaving school and working for periods of time and coming back to school--in and out of the employment market. That's going to create some problems.

A third change is that the notion of "one career for my life" is becoming largely obsolete as people find themselves changing their careers once, twice, or even more times as they move along. Partly, this would be a reflection of just boredom, that people don't want to do the same kinds of things again and again and again.

You will find more older people coming into the employment market; again, partly because of boredom with retirement which is really more than most people can stand, and partly because the economics of life are such that people on pensions and social security are often not adequately supported. A lot of them will be forced back into the market at least on a part-time basis.

Fourth, I think that the educational system will improve. I know that's a big assumption, but I think it will improve to the point where remedial effort, now the bulk of many manpower programs, will diminish in importance.

They won't have to have English as a second language, they won't have to have training in basic skills, they won't have to have high school equivalency as a major element of manpower programs because people are going to come out of high schools prepared to enter the work force. That may be an optimistic

assumption, but I think it's a trend.

I think the problems of alienation with work, or boredom, of dissatisfaction with going to work, will force all sorts of changes and will force the private economy into broad social plans.

I say that because I think that in order to attract and retain employees, employers are going to have to offer something more than work. What this is, I am not sure of; whether it's educational opportunities, whether it's recreational opportunities, or whether it's something that nobody ever thought of, I'm not sure. But I really think that it's going to be very tough to get people into competitive types of work. We are seeing that now in the auto industry in Europe. In following some of the experiments in the Scandinavian countries you know that all sorts of free designs of work are being tried to increase job satisfaction.

And finally, we are undergoing very radical changes in family life in this country. One need only look at the divorce rate, the proportion of women working, the number of children born outside legal marriage, and the new style of living in the communes, to recognize that all sorts of social support programs are going to have to be developed for families that are not really functioning as families, at least as we used to think of them.

All of these things say to me that the work of the social worker is going to undergo some significant changes. I believe he will be more involved in the private sector than he has been in the past and, perhaps, less in the public sector; certainly if the administration has its way, it will be a lot less in the public sector.

In a long-term sense, I think that the problem of dealing with the "disadvantaged population" will be gradually reduced, and that the manpower field will be dealing much more with questions of how to get people contented in their lives of work, and how to help people through transitional stages from work to education, or through changes in career along the way.

Therefore, if you are turning out people who are going to be leaders ten, fifteen, twenty years from now, which is really what most of you are engaged in doing, I think a lot of thought has to be given to whether or not they will be ready for those kinds of challenges, so distinct from the immediate challenge of getting somebody who can run a good manpower center for the Department of Employment, a good employment office for HRA, or a good casework consultation service for the WIN Program.

Those things need to be done, but I believe that one cannot afford to lose sight of the long-term goals. As these changes occur, it seems to me that a social worker is going to find himself in rather severe competition with people from other disciplines such as psychology, industrial relations, even education. I think they will be struggling to do all the kinds of things that social workers say they do now.

To digress for a moment, I'd like to mention an experience I had a number of years ago when I was employed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I used to visit prisons regularly to observe the processes going on there. At that time, there was a device called a Classification Committee, which normally consisted of an Associate Warden, Captain of the Correctional Officers, the psychiatrist or medical officer in attendance, the chaplain, the social workers, the educators, the psychologist if there was one. Every case that came into the institution was brought before that Committee for a determination of the individual's programs.

After I had sat through a lot of these discussions, I began to chart the Committee members' comments. The theory was that if you had all these different disciplines around the table, you would get the values and skills that each of them brought to the table.

The truth, however, was that there was no correlation between what people had to say and the professional discipline from which they came.

That is not in any way to denigrate the comments that they were making, but simply to say that the body of knowledge that we are talking about in that situation is an over-arching

body of knowledge that cuts across professions; and that people who are trained in education or sociology or social work, and people trained in psychology, do not know essentially different things.

There may be degrees of difference in orientation, there may be degrees of philosophical difference, but those seem to me to be small variations based on the individual personality or personal philosophy rather than the institutional or professional background.

I think the same is true in the field we are talking about today. Whether you are trained in a school of industrial relations, a school of social work, or in education, doesn't make a lot of difference. The kind of information you will need will be essentially the same thing.

I listened to some of you laying out a proposed curriculum and I was thinking that one was "Public Administration 101" and another was graduate "Legislative Social Policy": the same thing with different titles, the same basic kinds of skills and knowledge that you will find in any professional field.

That suggests that schools of social work really ought to think very carefully about whether they want to make an investment in developing curricula at either the undergraduate or graduate level that comprises a specialized social work approach to manpower problems. Frankly, I have grave reservations about that.

There are a number of such schools in the country, including Columbia, which have indeed developed extraordinarily valuable and useful manpower approaches within the school of social work. That principally reflects the strength and skills of the individuals that pursued support for their field of interest. I also think the institutions could have done it equally well in the school of industrial relations or the school of education, or in a lot of other places. I think it's almost an accident that they were in the school of social work.

I think it would be a far better investment of time and effort for most social work educators, particularly at the undergraduate level but even at the graduate level, to concentrate

on the development of cooperative relationships with other departments within the university, to identify pieces of the curriculum that are already adequately developed in other schools or other departments, and to concentrate on building cooperation among departments. For example, it is my understanding that here at Columbia, Mitch Ginsberg has been seeking to develop very close relationships with the School of Business Administration by recognizing that competence in management is very heavy there. Why is it necessary or useful to try to build the same set of skills within the School of Social Work?

So I offer a word of caution: before everybody leaps in and starts developing manpower education programs because manpower is important and popular, look around and see what's already there.

There's yet another value to cooperative programs, and that is that the students get a variety of philosophies and exposure to different parts of the university. It's a mistake for any student in any field to spend all of his time in one area rather than being exposed to other orientations. That's how we build up the notion that is so prevalent in my organization--that a social worker can't work with a manpower expert, a manpower person can't work with a drug counselor, and a drug counselor can't work with anybody else. That's why you get this historical fight between the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Labor that has crippled manpower programs for years.

I think that traces back to people wanting to get everything identified with their particular profession, and their particular institutional background rather than recognizing the need, skills, and the contributions that other departments can make. We spent, over the last ten years, a lot more time on honoring who should be in charge than we have on the substance of the program. It's time to get on with the substance.

A MANPOWER PERSPECTIVE FOR NASW

Mark Battle
National Association of Social Workers

We have to face squarely the notion that the setting doesn't necessarily define the profession. This is an issue which we fail to come to grips with all the time. The settings, the contents, do define the substance of practice but they don't define the essential structure of the profession.

There is a real problem for any profession that faces a new area--its own professional role identification, if there is one. And if there isn't one, we have to face that squarely and say so. The issues of what social workers should do in manpower and what they can do, are both very legitimate questions.

It may very well be that the arena of advocacy, of environmental manipulation, is the arena in which we have to put the heavy emphasis when we move into manpower.

There is no question about the professional association having a commitment to the appropriate involvement of social work in manpower. Our current delegate assembly is dealing with manpower as one of the five primary issues.

The major part of its concern has to do with what is happening with social workers on the current scene; but there is another part that has to do with what is happening to social work clients in the current scene. That part propels the profession into facing squarely the implications of the elimination of the

---

Mark Battle, Associate Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers, is engaged in the broad reorganization being undertaken by NASW. Formerly Deputy Director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Deputy Administrator of the Bureau of Social Programs, United States Department of Labor, he represents a personal prototype of a professional social worker who has made his mark in the manpower field.

Emergency Employment Act, which immediately puts 140,000 people out of work over a very limited time.

A concern of the profession with income maintenance is another indication of the concern with manpower, without reference to the specific development of manpower specialists or analysts. But it is just a short jump from a concern with manpower policy issues and clients to a concern with developing social workers who can be better prepared to deal with that kind of problem in society.

The Association has developed for itself a new manpower classification scheme. That scheme did not specifically take into account an involvement of social workers in manpower as we have been discussing it at this conference, but I would wager without much reservation that some of these concerns will be incorporated into that classification scheme at the next writing.

There is also a task force within the professional association in connection with definitions of specialization within the profession. All these years, specializations have been certified on the basis of settings, on the basis of problems, and on the basis of methods; but nobody has had a consistent set of definitions of specializations within the field. There is now an effort being made to do that, and I think that there will be serious consideration given to including a specialization in manpower or, at least, the inclusion of some of these manpower concerns in the specializations that are defined.

The professional association is also beginning to make a major move in the area of continuing education, not in terms of being the kind of resource that universities and schools of social work in themselves represent, but exercising leadership on a national level to insure that appropriate continuing education opportunities are afforded to all the members of the profession across the country. That continuing education design will include some of the manpower concerns that you have expressed here.

Now you note that I am saying "is going to," "certainly will," and "must take into consideration." It is clear that the professional association has not squarely addressed questions

in relation to the manpower field as they have been asked here.

It is clear also that the profession has been engaged, to some degree, in dealing with manpower concerns. I expect that the Association is going to take up the slack and become involved, after the fact as usual, with the concerns that its members have and the issues that affect the profession seriously. I think that NASW is going to engage in appropriate follow-up and try to play the kind of role it ought to play in manpower.

Participants

Sheila H. Akabas, Research Director, Industrial Social Welfare Center, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Ruth Antoniades, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Michael J. Austin, School of Social Welfare, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.

Beverly Bachemin, Manpower Development Specialist, Office of Research and Demonstration, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Mark Battle, Associate Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers, Washington, D.C.

Oscar R. Best, Jr., Assistant Manpower Planner, Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, Yonkers, N.Y.

Frank R. Breul, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Thomas L. Briggs, Director, Division of Continuing Education and Manpower Development, School of Social Work, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.

James M. Chavis, School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary, National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, N.Y.

Henry Cohen, Dean, Center for New York City Affairs, New School for Social Research, New York, N.Y.

Bernard J. Coughlin, Dean, School of Social Service, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Edwin Cryer, School of Social Work, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

Ruth Cubero, Manpower Coordinator, Regional Office of Economic Opportunity, New York, N.Y.

Gerson David, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.

Dennis Derryck, Director, Manpower Development Center, The Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

James Drinane, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Paul Elston, First Assistant Deputy Administrator, Department of Employment, Human Resources Administration, New York, N.Y.

Irwin Feifer, Experimental Manpower Laboratory, Mobilization for Youth, New York, N.Y.

Marvin Feit, School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Louis A. Ferman, Research Director, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Jean Szaloczi Fine, Chief, Manpower Research Branch, Division of Studies on Social Services and Life Support, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Murray Frank, Department of Urban Planning, Livingston College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

David S. Franklin, Regional Research Institute of Social Welfare, School of Social Work, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Ca.

Marcia Freedman, Senior Research Associate, Conservation of Human Resources Project, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Samuel Ganz, Director, Economic and Manpower Corporation, New York, N.Y.

Virginia Geyer, Work Incentive Program Generalist, Regional Office of Health, Education and Welfare, New York, N.Y.

Catherine Guyler, Training and Manpower Development Specialist, Regional Office of Health, Education and Welfare, New York, N.Y.

Charles Garvin, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Dean, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Eli Ginzberg, Director, Conservation of Human Resources Project, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Florence Gitten, Field Manager, Employment Eligibility Centers, Department of Social Services, New York, N.Y.

Barry Gordon, West Virginia College of Graduate Studies, Institute, W.V.

Charles Grosser, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

David A. Hardcastle, School of Social Welfare, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Lee Henney, Executive Vice-President, Economic and Manpower Corporation, New York, N.Y.

Myles Johnson, Staff Associate, Professional Standards/Manpower, National Association of Social Workers, Washington, D.C.

Valerie Jorrin, Project Director, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Alfred J. Kahn, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Nancy Kolben, Assistant Director, Columbia University Day Care Project, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Frank Kushin, Assistant Director, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Paul Kurzman, Program Director, Industrial Social Welfare Center, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Joan Laird, Senior Caseworker, Department of Social Services, Suffolk County, N.Y.

Gary Lefkowitz, Assistant Commissioner, New York City Department of Employment, Human Resources Administration, New York, N.Y.

Walter Leutz, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Elizabeth Lewis, Training Coordinator, Rural Manpower Research and Training Project, School of Social Work, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W.V.

Barbara Leyser, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Martin Lowenthal, Director, Social Welfare Regional Research Institute, Boston College, Boston, Mass.

Elizabeth Lubetkin, Assistant Director, Operations and Planning, Emergency Employment Act Program, Human Resources Administration, New York, N.Y.

Philip M. Marcus, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Russell A. Nixon, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Charles E. Odell, Deputy Director, U.S. Employment Service, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Herbert S. Parnes, Department of Economics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Pass, Planning Assistant, New York City Manpower Area Planning Council, New York, N.Y.

Alfred Peacock, Assistant to the Field Manager, Employment Eligibility Centers, Department of Social Services, New York, N.Y.

Janet I. Pinner, Director, Special Employment Services, New York State Division of Manpower Services, New York, N.Y.

Davis Portner, Director, Office of Planning and Evaluation, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Margaret Purvine, Educational Program Specialist, Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.

Lucille Rose, Deputy Administrator/Commissioner, Department of Employment, Human Resources Administration, New York, N.Y.

Sumner M. Rosen, Director, Training Incentives Payments Program, Institute of Public Administration, New York, N.Y.

Marvin Rosenberg, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Alvin L. Schorr, General Director, Community Service Society, New York, N.Y.

Edward E. Schwartz, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Joanne Searcy, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Audrey Sheppard, National Catholic School of Social Service, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Bernard M. Shiffman, Executive Vice-President, Community Council of Greater New York, New York, N.Y.

Philip L. Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Career Planning, Florida Board of Regents, Tallahassee, Fla.

Harry Specht, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, Ca.

Kurt Spitzer, School of Social Work, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

Onella Stagoll, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Edward I. Steuben, Director, Experimental Manpower Laboratory, Mobilization for Youth, New York, N.Y.

Jule M. Sugarman, Administrator, Human Resources Administration, New York, N.Y.

Elwood Taub, Executive Director, New York City Manpower Area Planning Council, New York, N.Y.

Robert Tropp, Laboratory for Community Programming, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Joseph L. Vigilante, Dean, School of Social Work, Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y.

Narayan Viswanathan, Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.

Anita Vogel, Director, Human Services Program Development, LaGuardia Community College, New York, N.Y.

Hyman J. Weiner, Director, Industrial Social Welfare Center, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Jerome Zimmerman, School of Social Work, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.